

IN BRIEF

Winston & Strawn Sues Hunter Biden Over Unpaid Legal Bills

Winston & Strawn sued Hunter Biden on Friday in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia over more than \$50,000 in unpaid legal fees related to the firm's representation of Biden in multiple federal investigations.

Biden has paid some of his outstanding legal bills to Winston, per the complaint, but failed to pay the balance after "repeated requests for payment."

The lawsuit follows the April departure of Biden's lawyer, Abbe Lowell, from Winston. Lowell's new firm, Lowell & Associates, will represent individuals engaged in high-profile and politicized investigations, sources indicated to Law.com.

Biden engaged Winston in December 2022 to represent him in "any congressional oversight and investigations" in which Biden was involved, as well as coordinating with other attorneys and advisers on communications strategy and assisting in investigations by the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. attorney for the District of Delaware.

Special counsel David Weiss indicted Biden in September 2023 on three felony charges related to his illegal purchase of a firearm in 2018; a federal jury found Biden guilty on all three charges in 2024. The same year, Biden was also convicted on three felony tax offenses and six misdemeanor tax offenses regarding unpaid federal taxes and false tax returns.

He was also subject to an investigation into the contents of his laptop, the hard drive of which was left at a Delaware computer repair shop and contained information that led to the federal gun charges.

In addition to agreeing to pay Winston within 30 days of receiving invoices, the complaint alleges that Biden agreed to a lien on "virtually all of his assets" as collateral.

Former Skadden Fellows Call Out 'Problematic' Effects From Trump Deal »2

Representatives for Biden could not immediately be reached for comment.

—Dan Roe

Study: Less Legal Departments Are Tracking DEI Metrics

The percentage of legal departments tracking their own diversity and that of outside counsel has plummeted over the past year, a study released Monday from the Association of Corporate Counsel and the recruiting giant Major, Lindsey & Africa found.

The 2025 Law Department Management Benchmarking Report found that just 15% of legal departments track internal diversity and 11% track diversity of outside counsel. Those percentages are roughly half what they were a year ago, when 32% of departments tracked internal diversity and 22% traced outside counsel diversity.

The findings mark a stark shift from recent years. The percentage of legal departments tracking internal diversity had been at least 28% every year since 2021, and the percentage tracking outside counsel diversity had trended slightly up, from 18% in 2021 to 21% in both 2022 and 2023 and 22% in 2024.

"This clearly highlights a potential reversal with a significant decline in the practice of formally tracking diversity metrics," the report says of the latest data. The 2025 study was based on responses from 395 legal departments with at least one ACC member. The departments submitted their responses between Feb. 13 to April 1, just weeks after President Donald Trump revoked DEI mandates across the federal government and raised the specter of criminally prosecuting companies with hiring or promotion practices that disadvantaged white men.

Law.com reported earlier this month that the backlash against DEI was likely to spur some GCs to pull back from tracking diversity, though it wasn't clear how dramatic the retreat would be.

"I was just at an event this week, and someone said, 'We were collecting it. We're not sure if we're going to continue,'" Jennifer McIver, a legal operations consultant at

» Page 4



AMLBot agreed to work with the victim on a contingency basis, taking a 20% cut of any recovered funds without upfront fees.

Crypto Theft Victim Faces New York Lawsuit From Firm That Helped Him Reclaim Assets

BY MICHAEL A. MORA

WHEN Robert Thompson's \$5 million in cryptocurrency disappeared, he didn't call the police. He called a company named AMLBot, a digital asset recovery firm operating out of Hong Kong. Within weeks, AMLBot claimed, the firm had done the impossible: traced the stolen crypto, found the perpetrator and helped Thompson begin recovering his funds.

But as Thompson pursued legal action halfway across the world—against a surprising suspect, his romantic partner in the Philippines—AMLBot was preparing its own legal strike. The firm has sued Thompson in Manhattan federal court, claiming he failed to pay the promised 20% success fee.

The amount in question is just over \$1 million.

Critics would say that in an industry built on the idea that transactions should be trustless and irreversible because the blockchain guarantees fairness, the irony is stark. Even justice, it seems, has a price—resulting in a dispute that returns to the traditional institution of the courts a claim for payment of services rendered.

The dispute arrives at a time when the crypto recovery business is booming, and so is the fraud that fuels it. The FBI reported over \$5.8 billion in crypto investment fraud losses in 2024 alone, up over 40% from four years ago. And since the FBI cannot handle all of the cases, an increasing number of recovery firms have rushed in—some reputable, and others predato-

» Page 6

More Criminal Defendants Are Wearing Sweaters to Courtroom. Are They Prejudicial?

BY EMILY SAUL

AS YOU already know, it does matter what your client wears to court.

But there is a question that has long plagued me, as a frequenter of both fashion and courthouses.

In the eyes of jurors, is there any perceivable difference between a defendant who wears a sweater and a defendant who wears a suit? Does one look more innocent or guilty? Is it merely practical? Does this actually matter at all?

Big thinkers, scientists and menswear bloggers have long reported that color does matter when it comes to the instant, snap judgments we make about others.

In his 1810 work, *Theory of Colors*, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe discussed the optics of perception of colors and linked categories of color to emotional and physiological response. Subsequent, downstream musings of others gave us the basic, pop psychology theories that red is aggressive, blue is trustworthy, etc.

» Page 4

Why Aren't Judicial Standing Orders Preventing Fake AI Case Citations?

BY ELLA SHERMAN

THERE'S a growing number of attorneys and pro se litigants in the U.S. submitting court filings with fake case citations produced by gen AI—even after judges issued standing orders and warnings to prevent these incidents from happening in the first place.

When the fake AI-generated case incidents first arose, experts expected the flawed filings to dissipate in

the face of judicial standing orders.

However, experts say the orders have been too ambiguous to solve the problem outright.

AI-specific judicial standing orders typically vary, either prohibiting or requiring the disclosure of the use of gen AI, or any AI, in a party's production of court filings. Some orders are more lenient, only suggesting the cautious use of AI in preparing court filings.

Maura Grossman, computer science research professor

» Page 6

Brooklyn Judge Won't Let Jurors Hear About Plaintiff's Immigration Status While Deciding Damage Award

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

A BROOKLYN judge refused to let a TikTok influencer introduce evidence presenting the immigration status of the man he injured in a 2017 highway accident, saying the evidence was irrelevant to jurors tasked with figuring out a damages award and potentially dangerous to the victim.

In excluding immigration evidence from the car accident case, Justice Aaron Maslow of the Supreme Court of Kings County, New York stressed the risk that amid the "intensified political climate" the evidence could undermine a 7-year old proceeding and deter noncitizen litigants from exercising their due process rights.

"Publicly revealing that a party or witness is potentially undocumented opens the door for some-



Judge Maslow

one—whether an opposing party, a spectator, or even a juror—to contact the Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") tipline, potentially triggering immigration enforcement actions," Maslow wrote.

"Permitting broad inquiry into a person's immigration status risks creating a significant chilling effect: If courtrooms are perceived as opportunities for [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] enforcement, undocumented immigrants might cease to exercise the civil right of pursuing compensation for personal injuries resulting from a tortfeasor's negligence," he added.

In a footnote, the judge pointed out that ICE had arrested two men at the Milwaukee County Courthouse. He further noted that the U.S. Department of Justice has filed a lawsuit to strike down a New York law preventing ICE from carrying out civil immigration arrests in and around state, city and municipal courthouses.

These concerns are "not idle speculation," Maslow wrote.

The judge has for years been overseeing the legal

» Page 6



EL SALVADOR PRESIDENCY VIA BLOOMBERG

Salvadoran troops guard the maximum security prison with deported U.S. individuals on March 16. Lawyers for migrants argue that the Trump administration's denial of due process has endangered them in countries like South Sudan, Libya, and El Salvador.

SCOTUS Gives Trump Green Light To Continue, For Now, 'Third Country' Deportations

BY JIMMY HOOVER

WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT will let the Trump administration, for now, continue to swiftly deport migrants to third countries like South Sudan in the latest win for President Donald Trump's wide-scale immigration crackdown.

Over the dissents of its three liberal justices, the high court on Monday granted a U.S. Department of Justice request to lift a judge's order requiring the government to afford meaningful due process to immigrants before removing them to countries they are not originally from. The Supreme Court did not explain its reasons for granting the request, which will freeze a lower court injunction pending further appeals.

The order comes after U.S. Solicitor General D. John Sauer had complained of a diplomatic "morass" created by the Boston federal judge's order, which caused immigration authorities to divert a plane carrying migrants bound for South Sudan. Receiving the order from U.S. District Judge Brian Murphy, the government rerouted the plane to a U.S. military base in Djibouti.

The Supreme Court's order spares immigration officials from having to comply, for now, with a preliminary injunction from the judge demanding substantial due process for migrants subject to such third country deportations.

Murphy had ordered the government to give immigrants at least 10 days to raise credible fears that they will face torture in a third country and another

» Page 4

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

Second Department

PERSONAL INJURY: Court grants plaintiff's motion to preclude bio-mechanical engineering expert. *Santana v. Peter Thomas Roth Labs LLC, Supreme Court, Kings.*

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: Motion to dismiss partially granted in eviction action. *Kings Village Corp. v. Pascal, Civil Court, Kings.*

CRIMINAL LAW: Motion to dismiss denied; defendant required to accept electric service. *People v. Coppola, Criminal Court, Kings.*

WHITE COLLAR CRIME: Court allows alternative service in cryptocurrency theft case. *People of The State of New York v. Unknown Parties, Supreme Court, Queens.*

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: Court applies equitable principles to decide issue of stipulation. *Upper Mechanical Corp. v. Harding, Supreme Court, Suffolk.*

CIVIL PROCEDURE: Court denies sealing of infant compromise order, no good cause found. *Stollow v. Gameng, Supreme Court, Suffolk.*

U.S. Courts

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: Clear, unambiguous promise not shown; reasonable reliance on promise not shown. *Lim v. Radish Media Inc., SDNY.*

SECURITIES LITIGATION: Proposed carve out to protective order rejected; SEC cab share materials under statute. Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Leibowitz, SDNY.

CIVIL PROCEDURE: Jurisdictional discovery into trust, its beneficiaries, defendant's citizenship ordered. *Rinderman v. Wilmington Savings Fund Society FSB, EDNY.*

DISPUTE RESOLUTION: Rideshare driver's bias claims need not be arbitrated; discovery on class ordered. *Williams v. Revel Rideshare, EDNY.*

CIVIL PROCEDURE: water damage insurance suit remanded; diversity jurisdiction amount cannot be met. *King v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., NDNY.*

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

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events.....	7
Court Calendars.....	9
Court Notes.....	9
Decisions.....	17
Expert Analysis.....	3
Lawyer to Lawyer.....	3
Legal Notices.....	14
Obituary.....	2
Outside Counsel.....	4
Technology Today.....	5, 6

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.

Click Listen Earn

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

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

VerdictSearch

Keep up with Verdict & Settlement Trends in Your State

Get exclusive access to news-breaking verdicts including:

- Insightful trends in your jurisdiction
- Detailed briefs
- Top weekly verdicts for your practice area

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

BONDS

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

☐ Appeals	☐ Supersedeas
☐ Discharge Lien	☐ Executor
☐ Guardian	☐ 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

New York Law Journal Inside

Health Care Law »3 Antikickback Developments and a New DOJ Enforcement Action by Robert M. Radick	Labor and Employment Law »3 The Future of the NLRB, As Constituted, Is in Doubt by Samuel Estreicher	Outside Counsel »4 Family Court Appeals And Ineffective Assistance Claims: Part 2 by Cynthia Feathers and Carolyn Walther	TECHNOLOGY TODAY »5 Cyber Crime: The AI Armed Offender by Peter A. Crusco	How AI Could Detect The Next Class Action: 'The Numbers Are Just Massive' by Amanda Bronstad	Former White House Special Adviser: The Race for AI Supremacy Is Fundamentally About National Security by ALM Staff »6
Online		Online	Why Are Cybercriminals Targeting Law Firms With Voice Phishing? by Benjamin Joyner	Legal Geek North America 2025: In-House Counsel Still Hoping for AI-Driven Shift to Fixed-Fee or Project-Based Billing by Benjamin Joyner	
➤ Court Calendars		➤ Today's Tip			
Civil and Supreme Court calendars for New York and surrounding counties are now available weeks in advance at nylj.com . Search cases by county, index, judge or party name. Important Part information, including addresses, phone numbers and courtrooms are updated daily. Only at nylj.com.					
➤ More Technology columns are archived at nylj.com .					
Calendar of Events »7					
Online					
➤ Submit a legal notice for publication on nylj.com .					

Former Skadden Fellows Call Out ‘Problematic’ Effects From Trump Deal

BY ABIGAIL ADCOX

SEVERAL former fellows of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom have raised alarm over the effect of the firm's pro bono deal with President Trump on its foundation's public interest work, while observers point to its chilling effects for the firm's own pro bono work going forward.

The concerns come as the firm has adjusted its foundation's website and the application criteria for prospective 2026 fellows, including removing a question on the "role of public interest work in addressing systemic racism."

Trump's deal with Skadden on March 28 specifically called out the firm's high-profile Skadden Foundation, a prestigious public interest law fellowship program funded by the firm. Former fellows have worked at host organizations like the ACLU, Legal Aid DC and New York Legal Assistance Group. In addition to the firm committing to \$100 million in pro bono work, the Trump deal said that Skadden fellows will "represent a wide range of political views, including conservative ideals."

Former Skadden fellows, in interviews with Law.com, raised concerns about the deal's effect on the nature of Skadden fellows' public interest work and host organizations they work with, with one noting that the Trump agreement "changes the integrity of the [Skadden fellow] network."

"More and more, as we hear what's going on through the news, it's going to be harder to separate the Foundation from the firm, and I think the longer that they continue to capitulate to Trump, the more

difficult it's going to be to separate the Foundation from endorsing the actions of the Trump administration," the former fellow said.

Another said the deal seemed counter-productive to the Foundation's work.

"A lot of former fellows and I work were obviously shocked by the capitulation, but we're also shocked at the insinuation that the [Skadden Foundation] does political work, because the point of the Foundation's work and all of the fellows, and the work that we do is anti-poverty work, and the insinuation that that is a political issue is really problematic," the former Skadden fellow said.

A third former fellow echoed concerns about reputational damage to the foundation.

"It will absolutely harm the reputation of the Fellowship. Skadden has spent over 35 years building the Fellowship into the most prestigious public interest job available for law graduates. But what law student will want to apply now?" the former fellow said.

The concerns came to a fever pitch when Skadden Foundation's executive director Kathleen Rubenstein publicly resigned earlier this month, writing on LinkedIn that "this moment in history calls on us to provide more and better support for public interest lawyers."

"Funders have many more resources than grantees. We also rarely have our own lives or liberties on the line. The least we can do is act with urgency and courage commensurate with those we support. I felt we had fallen short—or rather, that they haven't yet risen to that challenge," Rubenstein wrote. "My hope is that Skadden charts a path that respects the rule



Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, and Flom offices in Manhattan

of law and honors the core values of the Skadden Foundation."

The Foundation's changes to its public-facing website and the application criteria for 2026 prospective fellows have raised more alarm.

An online portal for former Skadden fellows to stay connected also appeared to be down for a period around the time of the firm's deal with the administration, according to several former Skadden fellows. Communication lines to former Skadden fellows have also been quiet.

"The website was down for fellows for quite a while, right during the capitulation and immediately afterwards, which has never, in my experience, happened before," one former Skadden fellow said. "And that was another thing that I would have expected communication from the firm or the foundation about."

While it's not uncommon for former Skadden fellows not to hear from the firm itself, the Founda-

tion typically sends semi-regular newsletters to keep former fellows apprised on updates on the work current and former fellows are doing, etc. Several former fellows said they were surprised they hadn't heard from the Foundation about the deal or other changes occurring behind the scenes at the Foundation.

The Skadden Foundation's website has also scrubbed some of the references it had to host organizations for fellows, according to a previous version of the website on the Wayback Machine. And the homepage for the Skadden Foundation now has a statement from its interim director Susan Plum, emphasizing its "nonpartisan approach" and mission.

"We recognize that maintaining a broad, nonpartisan approach in an increasingly polarized climate is more difficult than ever, and some believe it runs counter to the Foundation's purpose and values. We fundamentally disagree. In fact, the opposite is true," Plum wrote. "This moment is precisely when the Foundation must adhere to its core foundational principle of transcending division to enable the Fellows' work where it is needed most."

Plum did not immediately respond to an additional request for comment, and Skadden representatives did not immediately respond to several questions regarding the firm's pro bono work.

Under the terms of the agreement, Skadden agreed to fund no fewer than five Skadden fellows each year dedicated to assisting veterans, ensuring fairness in the justice system, and combating antisemitism, among other areas.

While veterans' issues and other areas have previously fallen under the work Skadden fellows have done, the deal could dissuade the Foundation from taking up certain work, some observers said.

"The extent to which Skadden fellows were doing a lot of work on systemic issues, I think it's going to be very hard for them to do that going forward," said Georgetown law professor Tanina Rostain. "So issues around race, around gender, justice, immigration, I think it's going to be much harder for them to do that kind of work."

other deals Trump made with law firms.

"When it's in a larger firm's name, I'm going to be honest, it makes it easier for the firm to say no to a certain client and say yes to others," said David Johnson, assistant dean for advocacy programs at George Washington University Law School.

Pro bono work that firms are willing to do already has limits based on their paid clients. "I think the kind of pro bono work they do is going to get more and more limited," Rostain said.

Still, Skadden has already taken on one pro bono matter opposite the administration in recent weeks. Several Skadden attorneys are listed as co-counsel to the National Immigrant Justice Center in an immigration case involving a 38-year-old woman from Mexico who filed a suit against the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services last month for denying her a visa.

The specific terms of the Skadden and other firms' agreements with the Trump administration do not prevent them from taking on certain types of pro bono work, including those "antagonistic to administration policies," said Stephen Gillers, New York University legal ethics professor.

"Since the settling firms are free to do this, I don't know why they would hesitate, except for fear of antagonizing the administration," said Gillers, but adding "refusing pro bono work that may anger the administration, when the firms do not have to do so, effectively restricts them more extensively than promised."

Abigail Adcox can be reached at aadcox@alm.com.

9th Circuit Allows Trump's National Guard Deployment to LA for Now

BY AVALON ZOPPO

LOS ANGELES

THE U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit late Thursday granted a stay that allows President Donald Trump to temporarily keep National Guardsmen deployed in Los Angeles to quell unrest over ongoing Immigration and Customs Enforcement raids in and around the city.

Judges Eric Miller, Mark Bennett and Jennifer Sung held that Trump likely lawfully exercised his power under a statute that authorizes federalization of the National Guard when the president "is unable with the regular forces to execute the laws of the United States."

The panel said U.S. District Judge Charles Breyer of the Northern District of California was wrong to conclude that the statute can't be invoked when some execution of the laws remains possible. And



Judges Mark Bennett, Eric Miller and Jennifer Sung of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

the judges pointed to instances where protesters threw objects at ICE vehicles as an example of how federal officials' ability to execute the laws was "significantly impeded."

"Plaintiffs' own submissions

state that some protesters threw objects, including Molotov cocktails, and vandalized property," the panel wrote of the days leading up to the Trump's June 7 deployment of the National Guardsmen. "According to the declarations submitted

by Defendants, those activities significantly impeded the ability of federal officers to execute the laws."

In a statement following the ruling, California Attorney General Rob Bonta called the decision disappointing but said the legal fight is "far from over."

"The Trump Administration far overreached its authority with its unprecedented and unlawful federalization of the California National Guard and deployment of military troops into our communities," Bonta said. "While the court did not provide immediate relief for Angelenos today, we remain confident in our arguments and will continue the fight."

On June 7, Trump invoked Section 12406 to order 4,000 National Guard members into federal service for 60 days to protect federal personnel and federal property in Los Angeles amid civil unrest over ICE raids in the city.

Gov. Gavin Newsom and California Attorney General Rob Bonta sued Trump, the U.S. Department of Defense and Defense Secretary Pete Hegseth claiming the administration exceeded its authority under Section 12406 and violated the 10th Amendment of the Constitution by militarizing the city without the governor's consent.

In issuing a temporary order halting the deployment, Breyer also found that the Trump administration didn't comply with part of Section 12406 that requires that orders federalizing the National Guard "shall be issued through the governors of the States."

But the Ninth Circuit on Thursday said that requirement was fulfilled when Hegseth sent a memorandum to California's adjutant general on June 7 to effectuate the president's memorandum, which was forwarded to Newsom.

"Although Governor Newsom did not personally issue the order

relinquishing state command, § 12406 requires that the President's order be issued through the Governor, not directly by the Governor," the panel said.

The Ninth Circuit, however, did reject the Trump administration's argument that the president has an "inherent constitutional authority" to deploy the National Guardsmen and that the claims weren't reviewable by the court.

In a statement following the ruling, Sen. Alex Padilla, R-California, said that Trump's deployment of the California National Guard "only served to inflame tensions in Los Angeles."

"The court's decision strongly reaffirms that the Guard can only be deployed in clearly defined circumstances—not as a political weapon against Californians at the sole discretion of Donald Trump," Padilla said.

Avalon Zoppo can be reached at azoppo@alm.com.

Justices Unlikely To Touch Tariffs Before They Leave for Summer

BY ALM STAFF

THE U.S. Supreme Court on Friday rejected Akin Gump Strauss Hauser & Feld's effort to get President Donald Trump's tariffs in front of the justices before their summer recess.

The justices offered no legal explanation for why they refused to expedite Akin Gump's pending writ for certiorari before judgment, as is customary.

The refusal comes only a few days after Akin Gump submitted its petition for certiorari, which sought immediate high court intervention in the closely watched legal battle over Trump's sweeping tariff orders. Those orders will force two toymakers—and Akin Gump clients—to pay over \$100 million in tariffs in 2025, more than 40 times



U.S. Supreme Court building in Washington, D.C., on May 1.

what they paid in 2024, according to Akin Gump's petition.

The tariffs, issued in February and April, are currently under

review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. But Akin Gump urged the justices to review the orders ahead of the circuits, and to expedite considering that petition.

Had the Am Law 100 firm's gambit been accepted, the justices could have granted certiorari before they recessed for the summer, which would have allowed oral arguments to occur immediately once the next term begins. In its motion to expedite, Akin Gump suggested that oral arguments on the legality of the tariffs could occur as soon as September.

Akin Gump had pushed to accelerate the already rapidly developing litigation over the tariffs, arguing that U.S. businesses and consumers were "bleed[ing]

billions of dollars each month" paying the "punishing" toll. The severe economic effect, which has sent the stock market spinning, warrants skipping the "normal appellate process," the firm argued.

Trump had enacted the tariffs through the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, a decades-old statute that lets the president "regulate importation" to address an "unusual and extraordinary threat."

Citing drug trafficking and the growing trade deficit, Trump used IEEPA to set a baseline 10% tariffs on goods from virtually every country, even higher duties for dozens of major trade partners, including China, Canada, Mexico and the European Union.

Critics of the tariffs argue that IEEPA cannot be used to enact new duties, and that even if the statute

could be used for tariffs, Trump's tariffs are too wide-reaching to stand.

Both the U.S. Court of International Trade and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia have rejected the duties on separate grounds, with the trade court taking the additional step of blocking the tariffs nationwide. Akin Gump's suit, filed on behalf of Learning Resources Inc. and hand2mind Inc., went before the district court, which only offered immediate relief to the toymakers. Both orders have been put on ice, allowing the White House to continue the tariffs throughout the course of the appeal.

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

Reach your peers to generate referral business

LAWYER TO LAWYER

Contact Carol Roberston at 212-457-7850 or crobertson@alm.com

Expert Analysis

HEALTH CARE LAW

Antikickback Developments
And a New DOJ Enforcement Action

This edition of the Healthcare Enforcement column discusses two judicial decisions from recent months relating to the Antikickback Statute (AKS), and briefly mentions a third notable case that was recently filed and is likely to garner considerable attention going forward.

First, a district court rejected an argument that, in the civil context, sought to narrow the reach of the AKS to only “corrupt” arrangements or transactions.

Second, a federal appeals court reversed an AKS criminal conviction, finding the evidence insufficient to show that the payments at issue were made to “relevant decisionmakers” with power over healthcare decisions.

Third, the Department of Justice recently filed a major enforcement action asserting that three of the largest health insurers in the country violated the FCA by paying hundreds of millions of dollars in kickbacks, allegedly so that insurance brokers would enroll patients in the insurers’ Medicare Advantage plans.

U.S. District Court Rejects Effort to Limit the Reach of the AKS to Only “Corrupt” Transactions

In *Vertex Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*, 24-cv-2046, 2025 WL 958272 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2025), the biotechnology company Vertex initiated a lawsuit under the Administrative Procedure Act to challenge an advisory opinion issued by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The advisory opinion related to a proposed “Fertility Support Program” by which Vertex intended to provide up to \$70,000 in fertility treatments to patients who suffer

By
Robert M.
Radick



from serious blood diseases and were considering undergoing the company’s novel and potentially curative gene-editing therapy, CASGEVY, which requires chemotherapy that can severely harm a patient’s fertility.

HHS’s advisory opinion determined that the Fertility Support Program would constitute “prohibited remuneration” under both the AKS and the Beneficiary Inducement Statute (BIS), because

And, regarding inducement, the court concluded that Vertex’s motive in removing the financial barrier to fertility preservation services was to change patients’ and physicians’ behavior and encourage them to select CASGEVY to treat their blood disorders.

it would cause patients to purchase CASGEVY or induce healthcare providers to recommend CASGEVY over other appropriate treatments.

In its lawsuit in the D.C. District Court challenging HHS’s advisory opinion, Vertex sought a declaratory judgment that its proposed Fertility Support Program was compliant with the BIS and AKS in part because the program would not involve corrupt payments.

On March 31, 2025, following cross-motions for summary judgment, Chief Judge James E. Boasberg issued a decision in which he upheld HHS’s advisory opinion and rejected Vertex’s challenge to the opinion’s determination that the Fertility Support Program would violate both the BIS and the AKS.

Regarding the AKS, the statute contains, in relevant part, a provision that makes it a felony to “knowingly and willfully offer[] or pay[] any remuneration . . . to any person to induce such person” either “(A) to refer an individual to a person for the furnishing . . . of any item or service for which payment may be made in whole or in part under a federal health care program, or (B) to purchase . . . any good, facility, service, or item for which payment may be made in whole or in part under a federal health care program.” 42 U.S.C. §1320a-7b(b)(2).

Focusing on the words “induce” and “remuneration,” Vertex argued that those terms carry what Judge James Boasberg referred to as “specialized criminal connotations,” and Vertex further contended, based upon principles of statutory interpretation, that the use of the terms induce and remuneration in the AKS meant that the statute reaches only “corrupt” transactions that are different in kind from the Fertility Support Program.

Boasberg began his analysis of the AKS issue in the *Vertex* case by focusing on the meaning of the words “remuneration” and “induce”. Regarding the term “induce,” Vertex argued that, in the context of the AKS, “induce” carries a “specialized criminal-law meaning that restricts the reach of the statute to corrupt *quid-pro-quo* transactions.”

In support of this position, Vertex relied largely upon the Supreme Court’s decision in *United States v. Hansen*, 599 U.S. 762 (2023), in which the court found, in a statute that prohibits “induc[ing]” an alien to come to or reside in the United States without legal authority, that the term “induce” was used in a “specialized, criminal-law sense.”

However, applying principles of statutory interpretation, Boasberg found the statute at issue in *Hansen* “an unsuitable analog” to the AKS, because the AKS has multiple carve outs for innocent transactions that would become redundant if the statute required a showing of unlawful conduct.

» Page 7

LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW

The Future of the NLRB,
As Constituted, Is in Doubt

The future of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or Board), the venerable agency that since 1935 has been the exclusive investigation, enforcement, and adjudicatory body under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA or Act), 49 Stat. 449 (1935), is in doubt.

Although the subject of over 50 Supreme Court decisions and several thousand federal appeals decisions, the Supreme Court’s relatively new “unitary executive” jurisprudence raises serious questions over whether the president can unilaterally remove members of the board before their terms have expired and without demonstrating cause for such removal, as defined in the act.

The constitutionality of a multimember agency like the NLRB was upheld in the court’s unanimous 1935 decision in *Humphrey’s Executor v. United States*, 295 U.S. 602.

In an opinion authored by Justice George Sutherland, one of the conservative “Four Horsemen” on the court presumably bent on overturning much of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr. (FDR)’s New Deal agenda, the court upheld the Federal Trade Commission’s structure (similar to the NLRB) even though the president could not remove FTC commissioners at will before their term was up.

It explained that Congress can create agencies outside the executive departments to enforce federal statutes provided they do not wield “purely executive” powers but, rather, exercise “quasi-judicial” and “quasi-legislative” powers.

Though its reasoning may appear a bit opaque to today’s readers, the essence of the court’s ruling was that the executive power of the United States could be shared between the president and these multimember agencies.

By
Samuel
Estreicher



For the *Humphreys* Court, it was ultimately a question of institutional design for Congress to decide in the first instance: statutes lodged with the executive departments would be presumed to be under the control of the president, subject to the substantive provisions of the legislation.

Those committed to multimember agencies were somewhat shielded from executive control. Under the Constitution’s appointments clause, the president had to appoint

Though its reasoning may appear a bit opaque to today’s readers, the essence of the court’s ruling was that the executive power of the United States could be shared between the president and these multimember agencies.

the agency heads (i.e., the Commissioners) subject to the Senate’s consent, but he could not remove them without cause during their terms. Over time, *Humphrey’s Executor’s* reasoning has been extended to the NLRB and many other federal multimember agencies.

This stable jurisprudence first began to unravel with Justice Scalia’s fiery dissent in *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654 (1988), a decision sustaining the constitutionality of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 92 Stat. 1824. That law created a special court and independent counsel not subject to the usual executive oversight and removable by the attorney general only for cause.

His dissent reasoned that law enforcement was a purely executive function that could not be

shielded from the president’s removal authority implied under Article II’s vesting of the entire executive power in the president. For Justice Antonin Scalia, for the president to be able to “faithfully execute” the laws of the United States, as Article II requires, the president had to have the untrammelled authority to remove at will officers of the United States who exercise executive authority.

A further step in the Supreme Court’s recognition of the central importance of an uncabined presidential removal power came in Chief Justice Roberts’ opinion for the court in *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*, 561 U.S. 477 (2010), a case involving the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, 116 Stat. 745.

The court ruled that the board members of Sarbanes-Oxley’s Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB)—considered to be “inferior officers” who could be appointed by the agency head or a court of law (rather than the president)—could not constitutionally be shielded from presidential removal when the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the agency that supervises the PCAOB, were themselves presumed to be protected from at-will removal.

The opinion holds that “such multilevel protection from removal is contrary to Article II’s vesting of the executive power in the president.”

A third step was in *Seila Law, LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 591 U.S. 197 (2010), another opinion for the court by Chief Justice Roberts. The court held that Congress in the Dodd Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank), 124 Stat. 1376 (2010), could not constitutionally create a single-head “independent agency” and immunize that official from at-will removal by the president.

Although the opinion extensively discusses the special problems with single-head as opposed to multimember independent agencies, the court emphasized that . left in place” two exceptions to the president’s unrestricted removal power.” One exception was for “inferior officers” of the

» Page 6

BONDS

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

Express Solutions Expressly for Bonding Problems Since 1933

THE

BLAIKIE

GROUP

☐ Appeals

☐ Discharge Lien

☐ Guardian

☐ Supersedeas

☐ Executor

☐ Lost Instrument

111 John St., 16th Floor, New York, New York 10038

212-962-BOND 212-267-8440

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

www.blaikiegrou.com



LAWYER TO LAWYER

FLORIDA ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF RANDY C. BOTWINICK
Formerly of Pazer, Epstein, Jaffe & Fein

CONCENTRATING IN PERSONAL INJURY



RANDY C. BOTWINICK
34 Years Experience

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



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



JAY HALPERN
39 Years Experience

Co-Counsel and Participation Fees Paid

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

MIAMI

150 Alhambra Circle
Suite 1100, Coral Gables, FL 33134
P 305 895 5700 F 305 445 1169

PALM BEACH

2385 NW Executive Center Drive
Suite 100, Boca Raton, FL 33431
P 561 995 5001 F 561 962 2710

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

From Orlando to Miami... From Tampa to the Keys | www.personalinjurylawyer.ws

Reach your peers to generate referral business

LAWYER TO LAWYER

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

TERSOWITZ 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

JUDGMENT ENFORCEMENT & COMMERCIAL COLLECTIONS

ROSENTHAL & GOLDHABER P.C.

- NY Law Journal 4-Time Winner: Best Judicial Enforcement Provider
- Recovery Actions
- Post-Judgment Litigation
- NY, National & Int'l

R&G

Contact or Visit Us:
631-979-8500
robert@nycollections.com
nycollections.com

Justice Isn't Complete Until It's Collected



Strategic Merger Analysis



Diversity Insights



Events & Retreats Insights



Benchmark Financials



Emerging Legal News



Lateral Hires



Surveys & Reports



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

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

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

ALM.Intelligence | LEGAL COMPASS

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

Off the Front

Deportations

« Continued from page 1

two weeks to contest any findings to the contrary. The judge issued those commands after finding that the government flouted his earlier order to give immigrants a “meaningful opportunity” to raise fears under the Convention Against Torture.

The court’s decision inspired a blistering dissent from Justice Sonia Sotomayor, accusing the majority of “rewarding lawlessness” and a “gross abuse of the Court’s equitable discretion.”

“Apparently, the Court finds the idea that thousands will suffer violence in farflung locales more palatable than the remote possibility that a District Court exceeded its remedial powers when it ordered the Government to provide notice and process to which the plaintiffs are constitutionally and statutorily entitled,” wrote Sotomayor, joined by Justices Elena Kagan and Ketanji Brown Jackson. “That use of discretion is as incomprehensible as it is inexcusable. Respectfully, but regrettably, I dissent.”

Sotomayor also pilloried the Trump administration for its conduct in the case, where she accused the government of brazenly violating the trial judge’s orders to afford due process in third country deportations by giving migrants virtually no notice before loading them on planes to countries like South Sudan.

“The Government has made clear in word and deed that it feels itself unconstrained by law, free to deport anyone anywhere without notice or an opportunity to be heard,” she wrote. “The episodes of noncompliance in this very case illustrate the risks.”

‘Small Modicum of Process’

Under U.S. immigration laws, immigrants with removal orders are prohibited from being deported to their country of origin if an immigration judge finds they are likely to face severe persecution upon their return.

In that instance, the government may, in some cases, deport the immigrant to a “third” country. After Trump’s Department of Homeland Security began ramping up third-country deportations in February, four Latin American migrants targeted for removal to third countries filed a class action challenging the deportations in Massachusetts federal court.

Since then, Murphy has issued a series of court orders requiring the government to first provide notice to the immigrant class members and give them an opportunity to argue that they will face torture in those places.

“Plaintiffs are simply asking to be told they are going to be deported to a new country before they are taken to such a country, and be given an opportunity to explain why such a deportation will likely result in their persecution, torture, and/or death,” Murphy said in issuing a preliminary injunction on April 18. “This small modicum of process is mandated by the Constitution of the United States.”

In May, Murphy found that the government violated his injunction by providing minimal notice, mostly overnight, to a group of class members who were loaded onto a plane destined for South Sudan. The U.S. State Department has warned that South Sudan presents risks of “crime, kidnapping, and armed conflict.”

In March, the U.S. Embassy in Juba, South Sudan’s capital, said it was “reducing to minimal staffing ... due to continued security threats.” International experts say the country is at risk of civil war.

Receiving the judge’s order midflight, the government rerouted the plane to a military base in Djibouti, where the migrants were held in the custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

In his emergency request for Supreme Court intervention last month, Sauer stated the judge had created a “diplomatic and logistical morass,” adding that the U.S. military base in Djibouti lacks the resources to house migrants the government has characterized as dangerous criminals.

Lawyers for a class of migrants subject to these controversial third country deportations responded by saying the situation resulted from the Trump administration’s own intransigence and refusal to afford meaningful due process to those it intends to send to dangerous countries like South Sudan, Libya and El Salvador.

“Their quarrel is not with the injunction but with the law itself and, thus, is not something this Court should remedy by means of an emergency stay,” the attorneys wrote.

Until Monday, the Supreme Court had been skeptical of the Trump administration’s efforts to remove immigrants to foreign countries. The justices upheld a Maryland federal judge’s order to “facilitate” the return of Kilmar Armando Abrego Garcia to the United States from a prison complex in El Salvador where he was deported by mistake.

Further, the justices effectively grounded the government’s efforts to use the Alien Enemies Act to send additional planes of suspected Venezuelan gang members to El Salvador’s notorious CECOT prison. There, the court found that the Trump administration had not provided the migrants enough time to contest their removals.

Still, in the Alien Enemies Act litigation, the court made clear that the Trump administration could continue to deport individuals under other legal authorities.

The Trump administration claims it has been building a “productive working relationship” with South Sudan to take in deported immigrants, though some officials in the country have expressed concerns over taking in migrants with criminal records.

In April, Secretary of State Marco Rubio said his agency was revoking visas for South Sudanese passport holders over the country’s alleged refusal to repatriate its deported citizens.

The case is *Department of Homeland Security v. D. V.D.*, No. 24A1153.

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

flashy and expensive items, like high-end watches or jewelry. If the town is lower-income or rural, it might be best to avoid pieces like that entirely.

“Don’t wear funky patterns, stick to neutrals,” she explained.

It’s also important that a defendant or witness not wear anything too interesting because jurors are easily distracted.

“You’re a juror, you can’t take your phone out, there are a lot of breaks, you’re bored out of your mind, but you’re trying to do a good job,” Dominic said in one example. “And then the next witness comes in, maybe the finance expert, and they have a necklace on that has some strange pendant on it you’ve never seen before.”

“People can’t help but wonder, ‘What is that?’” he noted.

And if a juror is lost in thought, wondering about a pendant or a pattern on a shirt, they’re not listening to the testimony. Or, even worse, they could be drawing improper inferences.

Suter recalled a recent case in which an expert wore a tie with something like cartoon characters on it.

“When we spoke to jurors, they didn’t like that,” Suter said. “They didn’t think it fit the setting.”

Arthur Aidala, a known New York City clotheshorse and defense attorney, attributes the decline in formal court dress to the societal shift toward more casual and comfortable clothing.

“I saw an attorney in the well the other day in flip-flops!” he bemoaned.

“Society is dressing down,” he lamented, that day clad in a pin-stripe summer suit. “That bleeds into what defendants wear.”

Of course, practicality trumps all. But Sam Mangel, a federal prison consultant, says he does not see any upside on the utility front to a sweater.

“I always recommend my clients wear a suit,” Mangel said. “Not business casual.”

Referencing Mangione, Mangel said sweaters make people look younger.

“For whatever reason he has been advised to look the part of a young kid,” he said of the now 27-year-old. “I think that’s been successful for him in terms of garnering support. But if you’re a professional? I advise to wear a suit and tie.”

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

Outside Counsel

Family Court Appeals and Ineffective Assistance Claims: Part 2

This is Part Two of a two-part article on ineffectiveness assistance of counsel (IAC) in Family Court cases. Part One offered an overview of legal standards and preservation of IAC claims. This installment discusses many cases in which IAC arguments were rejected or accepted upon appeal. Cases Finding No IAC

Arguments that counsel failed to provide meaningful representation are generally found unpersuasive upon appeal. There are many bases for such rulings, but three common reasons given are that: (1) perfect representation is not required, and counsel did a good enough job, even if they made mistakes; (2) there may have been strategic reasons for the relevant actions or inactions; and (3) the arguments are speculative. Cases below illustrate these grounds.

Matter of Ronan L. (Jeana K.), 195 AD3d 1072 (3d Dept 2021), goes into detail in rejecting the IAC claim asserted by the mother in a Family Ct Act article 10 proceeding. Counsel had declined to seek discovery of the petitioner’s records. Such lapse was forgiven because Family Court said that counsel could review the subject records and object later. Counsel did object to certain hearsay in the records, but the court held that hearsay from the children could be admissible if corroborated.

Further, the mother’s attorney thoroughly cross-examined the petitioner’s witnesses and made successful objections. It was not a problem that counsel did not call any witnesses on the mother’s behalf, since the record did not indicate who those witnesses might be.

In considering IAC claims, some cases implicate unwise actions by the client. For example, in *Matter of Ramirez v Colon*, 225 AD3d 704,

CYNTHIA FEATHERS is an appellate attorney at the Albany County Public Defender’s Office and in Saratoga Springs. CAROLYN WALTHER is Appellate Counsel for Parent Representation at the New York State Office of Indigent Legal Services.



By Cynthia Feathers



And Carolyn Walther

705 (2d Dept 2024), the mother’s contention that she was deprived of competent representation was found to be without merit. As to the failure to seek an adjournment of a conference, the mother was aware of the court date but chose not to attend, so that was her fault.

Totality of Circumstances. More often cases merely acknowledge deficiencies by counsel but find

Effective trial counsel preserves each Family Court client’s right to appeal and facilitates their right to the assignment of appellate counsel.

that, viewed in totality, the flaws do not justify relief. For example, in *Matter of Aubree (Natasha B.)*, 217 AD3d 1565, 1566 (4th Dept 2023), the mother complained that her attorney did not object to inadmissible and prejudicial evidence. The appellate court held that, even if counsel should have objected, the mother received meaningful representation, including by lodging successful objections to other records.

Reviewing courts grant leeway to trial counsel based on the premise that there may have been a strategic reason for an action. Sometimes the strategy seems clear. For example, in *Matter of Laura E. v Matthew E.*, 226 AD3d 1117, 1118-1119 (3d Dept 2024), the mother asserted that her attorney should have cross-examined the father on certain subjects. However, in light of other evidence, counsel may have determined that further testimony would not have benefited the mother.

IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

Wolters Kluwer, told Law.com early this month. “That’s the conversation now—not whether DEI matters, but whether tracking it this way is still worth the risk.”

The overall declines in internal and law firm diversity tracking wasn’t the only bad news in the report for diversity advocates, who argue that gathering the data is an essential first step in fostering opportunities for lawyers from historically disadvantaged backgrounds. They also argue that tapping into talent from a broader range of backgrounds creates stronger legal teams.

Even before this year’s survey, legal departments were showing an increasing reluctance to use diversity metrics to punish or reward their outside counsel—and the latest figures show that trend has accelerated. The percentage of legal departments tracking outside counsel diversity that had “tangible consequences” for the firms based on how they performed peaked at 29% in 2022 before falling to 27% in 2023, 23% in 2024 and 11% this year.

—Trudy Knockless

Perkins Coie Lays Off 5% Of Professional Staff, Citing ‘Scheduled Changes’ To Workforce

Perkins Coie laid off roughly 5% of its U.S.-based professional staff this month, the firm confirmed to The American Lawyer on Monday.

A firm spokesperson said the cuts were a result of “scheduled changes” to the firm’s business professional ranks that fit the firm’s operational needs, and followed a firmwide review of strategic goals and best practices that took place over the past year. No lawyers were included as part of the cuts.

The layoffs were initially surfaced in a post on Fishbowl. Perkins finished 2024 with 4%

annual growth in gross revenue and a 16% uptick in profits per equity partner, according to American Lawyer data.

The firm was targeted by the Trump administration earlier this year because of its past representation of Democratic groups and allegedly illegal DEI practices. President Donald Trump’s March 6 executive order against the firm—which limited the firm’s access to federal courthouses, among other sanctions—would cause “catastrophic and unrecoverable economic harm” to the firm if it were allowed to stand, the firm argued to U.S. District Judge Beryl Howell of the District of Columbia.

Howell permanently enjoined the government from implementing the executive order in early May.

—Dan Roe

Walmart To Pay \$10M To Settle Charges It Let Money Transfer Scammers Run Wild

Walmart has agreed to pay \$10 million to settle a three-year-old Federal Trade Commission lawsuit alleging that it stood idly as scammers used its in-store money transfer services to swindle hundreds of millions of dollars from American consumers.

The suit charged that, from 2013 to 2018, Walmart lacked effective anti-fraud policies and procedures to protect its customers making transfers through such services as Western Union and MoneyGram.

The FTC alleged that Bentonville, Arkansas-based Walmart also failed to properly train employees on the potential for fraud and or warn consumers about that risk.

According to the suit, a 2014 MoneyGram audit of 397 Walmart locations found that 39% had primary employees who were untrained on money transfer fraud risks, and 60% had backup employees who were untrained. The FTC alleges that Walmart’s

That case makes another finding that merits mention. The mother’s attorney did not make a closing statement, but that was found acceptable—as has been held in many other decisions addressing IAC in the Family Court context. Understandably, in rendering decisions on the minimal level of lawyering required, the reviewing courts do not address what constitutes excellent representation.

To be sure, forgoing the opportunity for a summation is not a best practice. In a close case—particularly where opposing counsel and the AFC submit closing statements—an attorney’s failure to prepare such a statement can constitute a troubling and prejudicial omission. Whether counsel makes a closing statement in the courtroom, they should take full advantage of the opportunity to submit a comprehensive written statement that marshals the proof; cites to the record; and sets forth relevant law, cogent arguments, and the relief sought.

Counsel should seize every opportunity to advocate on behalf of the client—including the power to have a final potent word at the end of a lengthy Family Court proceeding. (For an eloquent exploration of the danger of expecting too little of counsel, see the dissenting opinions in *People v Alvarez*, 33 NY3d 286, 293-315 [2019] [coram nobis application asserted that appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance]).

Speculation and Strategy. In many decisions, in addressing strategy, the appellate court does not surmise what counsel’s strategy may have been and merely notes that the aggrieved party did not demonstrate the absence of strategic or other legitimate reasons for counsel’s alleged shortcomings (see e.g. *Matter of Carter H. [Seth H.]*, 191 AD3d 1359 [4th Dept 2021]).

A typical example of speculation as a reason to disapprove of an IAC claim is *Matter of Leonard P. (Patricia M.)*, 222 AD3d 1443, 1444-1445 (4th Dept 2023), *lv denied* 41 NY3d 905 (2024). The mother in an abuse » Page 8

Sweaters

« Continued from page 1

In 1976 in Estelle v. Williams, the U.S. Supreme Court found a defendant’s rights were violated after he was forced to stand trial in prison garb.

Jailhouse duds and Ferrari red are clearly alarming. But what about sweaters, which are becoming more common in court?

The question of defendant dress first began to gnaw at me in 2019, when Nxivm’s Keith Raniere appeared at trial in a pastel sweater reminiscent of a dad on Easter. While it was a step-up from his usual stale gym shorts, I thought it made him look more predatory.

I next noticed a burgundy sweater on Luigi Mangione in December 2024. And then, a couple months later, a filing hit the Sean Combs docket asking that the entertainer be provided with sweaters for court. He has appeared in neutral colors like heather grey and oatmeal, and even inspired a delightful New York Times fashion column about his “sweater defense.”

Facially, there is one consistency with these three defendants. Raniere was represented by Marc Agnifilo and Teny Geragos, then at Brafman & Associates and now partners at Agnifilo Intrater.

Mangione and Combs are also represented by Agnifilo Intrater, though Mangione’s defense team is led by Karen Friedman Agnifilo. The firm declined to speak with me for this piece.

So I talked to jury consultants and other jury-adjacent individuals.

The takeaway from my shockingly large number of conversations about this topic is that it does matter ... sort of. But, like everything, it’s a little more complicated than pitting a sweater against a suit.

As a top note, the main takeaway from consultants is that your clients’ attire does influence first impressions. Or, in the jargon of jury consultants, “initial credibility.”

Everyone agrees that courts are one of the last bastions of formality. Haberdashery should mimic what one might wear to a religious service or a funeral.

As Chris Dominic, senior jury consulting advisor at IMS Legal Strategies put it, the point is not to violate anyone’s expectations about what they think your client

should look like. Defendants, he said, need to tread within a “zone of expectation.”

“As soon as someone sees you, they’re forming impressions,” Dominic said. “And because of that, it is important to dress appropriately.”

“We’re just typically trying not to throw anybody off so that they can focus on the case,” Dominic said.

Faye Honig, director of jury research at Dubin Research & Consulting, said there’s a lot of misinformation about the kind of advice her profession offers.

“The jury isn’t going to care if the person is wearing a red tie or a yellow tie,” said Honig, who is also president of the American Society of Trial Consultants. “But my initial reaction is it does matter who the defendant is and what the crime is.”

People with public personas need to be aware of reconciling that image with concerns about celebrity entitlement, said Ross Suter, senior vice president of litigation solutions at Magna Legal Services.

Both Honig and Suter said they felt the sweater worked for Combs.

“It humanizes him and softens him,” Honig shared. “It seems less uptight.”

“The sweater makes him a lot more approachable,” Sutter opined of Combs. “It shows he’s being remorseful and that there’s humility there.”

Venue also matters. In the Bay Area, a client can likely get away with wearing a jacket or a sweater over a collared shirt. But if you’re in federal court in Texas, you should probably wear a tie, advised Dominic.

Dominic said he once worked on a case in Juneau, Alaska, where jurors were able to spot the non-local attorney from a mile away because he was walking around in a suit.

“If you’re trying to fit in among a group of people that really never wear suits or ties, then you’ve probably got to be a little careful about looking like you’re going to big-time somebody,” he said.

There are some clear no-nos. Martha Stewart made headlines in 2004 when, as her defense attempted to cultivate her image as an “everywoman,” she attended her insider trading trial with an Hermès Birkin handbag estimated at around \$10,000.

Honig advises clients to avoid

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.

The Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics provides ethics advice to approximately 3,600 judges and justices, as well as quasi-judicial officials of the NYS Unified Court System about their own conduct. Find opinions at: www.law.com/newyorklawjournal/judicial-ethics-opinions

Technology Today

CYBER CRIME

The AI Armed Offender

In my April column, I discussed cybercrime involving gift cards. That crime often takes the form of *phishing*, one of the more prevalent forms of cybercrime, where criminals trick victims into providing personal information including card numbers and PINs.

Hacking, another cybercrime method, may also be utilized as the offenders may hack gift card portals to steal and redeem balances, as well as using social engineering tactics to pressure individuals into purchasing gift cards and sharing their details as well as a myriad of other opportunities a resourceful hacker may utilize to prey on the unwary.

Other forms of cybercrime exist and continue to evolve to enrich the unscrupulous. For instance, ransomware attacks continue as a significant threat to private entities as well as government agencies, public utilities and other infrastructure.

In this month's column, we will discuss another cybercrime which has rapidly become a new money maker for the organized criminal element in society, that is, the introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) into various nefarious schemes.

The Increased Use of Deception by AI: Fugazy and Deep Fakes

The use of AI to deceive victims is on the rise. The FBI has warned of the escalating threat posed by cyber criminals utilizing artificial intelligence tools to conduct sophisticated phishing/social engineering attacks and voice/video cloning scams.

Cybercriminals are leveraging publicly available and custom-made AI tools to orchestrate highly targeted phishing campaigns, exploiting the trust and naivety of individuals and organizations alike.

PETER A. CRUSCO is principal of the Law Office of Peter A. Crusco P.C.



ADOBE STOCKS

These AI-driven phishing attacks are characterized by their ability to craft convincing messages tailored to specific recipients. Unlike the schemes of the past, these strategies contain proper grammar and spelling, increasing the likelihood of successful deception and data theft. See, *FBI Warns of Increasing Threat of Cyber Criminals Utilizing Artificial Intelligence*, San Francisco FBI Office, May 8, 2024.

Criminals have used AI algorithms to analyze encyclopedic troves of information to assist in targeting individuals, create personalized phishing emails, and fabricate “fugazy” or “deepfakes” involving voice and video for impersonation scenarios.

Deepfakes are image, audio, or video files that mimic real or nonexistent people saying and doing things that never happened. Deepfakes leverage artificial intelligence (AI) algorithms to manipulate digital content—ordinarily images, sounds, and videos—in which a person's likeness, voice, or actions are convincingly altered or fabricated. *Kohls v. Ellison*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4953 (D. Minn. 2025, Provinzino, J.).

For instance, in *United States v. Thompson*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 228684 (D. Mass. 2024, Kobick, J.), it was alleged that the search of defendant's iCloud account uncov-

ered videos of other minors using airplane bathrooms, as well as sexually explicit images of children apparently created through an artificial website website. See also, *United States v. James*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS

1510 (N.D. OH 2005, Brennan, J.) (AI employed to enhance child pornography).

The AI technology behind deepfakes is advanced and complex, making it difficult for the average person to detect the falsity of a deepfake. The technology to manipulate images, sounds, and videos existed before deepfakes entered the picture, but such technology was expensive, time-consuming, technical, and difficult to use for the ordinary person.

However, in the last 15 years, deepfake technology has become increasingly accessible and available, and ordinary people now can generate convincing deepfake content at little cost in a matter of minutes.

And with the concomitant rise of social media, deepfakes can be disseminated to millions of online users with the mere click of a button. See *Kohls v. Ellison*, *supra*; *Banks v. Cnty. of Riverside*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103359 (C.D. CA, 2025, Kewalramani, M.J.) (alleged false AI generated voice mail); Minnesota Statutes section 609.771, subd. 1(c) (2023) (defining a deep fake.)

Criminals have used AI to discover system weaknesses by automating the investigative process. AI can also generate malware, by making it stealthy. Tools enhanced by AI may be used to employ attacks on passwords and to adapt malware to be more efficient.

AI has been the subject of increasing litigation in the state courts. For instance, the Court of Appeals in *People v. Wakefield*, rejected



By Peter A. Crusco

Why Are Cybercriminals Targeting Law Firms With Voice Phishing?

BY BENJAMIN JOYNER

CYBERSECURITY is a perpetual concern for any enterprise, but recent events have served to make the dangers to law firms particularly stark. Last month, the FBI announced that a cyber threat actor, the Silent Ransom Group (SRG), has begun to exclusively target law firms, using voice phishing, or “vishing.”

Below, Legaltech News explains the threat of vishing, why and how SRG is targeting law firms, and how law firms can protect themselves and respond to attacks.

What Is Vishing?

Vishing, or voice phishing, has become an increasingly common tactic for hackers, as defenses against traditional ransomware have strengthened at the same time as the text-to-speech and voice cloning have improved exponentially.

“The email protection filters are getting really good at blocking malicious links to SharePoint, Dropbox, cloud based storage files where they’re trying to prompt you to type in your credentials, to harvest them or to hijack your session, as well as bad attachments,” said Michael Maschke, president and CEO of IT, cybersecurity and digital forensics provider Sensei Enterprises.

Vishing attacks rely less on social engineering to get employees to allow the criminal to install or use software in a malicious way, generally by posing as a trusted party. In the case of SRG, the criminals are posing as IT departments, asking employees to provide them access to resolve fictive problems.

“They’re pretending to be the IT department, saying that somebody needs to remote in and then saying, ‘Oh, I gotta run something overnight. Just leave your computer up,’” said Beth Waller, chair of the cybersecurity and data privacy practice at Woods Rogers. “That’s how people are falling prey. And this is particularly troubling because a lot of times the initial connection to the environment is not a known malware software.”

Once the hackers have access to a user's computer, they can extort money from victims by encrypting data in place, exfiltrate data and demand ransoms to avoid public disclosure, contact clients to apply pressure to firms, and directly contact firm leadership to increase urgency.

Law firms present both an attractive and soft target to criminal groups like SRG, because they possess both large amounts of valuable client data and the means to pay for its recovery. » Page 7

How AI Could Detect The Next Class Action: ‘The Numbers Are Just Massive’

BY AMANDA BRONSTAD

ARTIFICIAL intelligence has proven useful in class actions and mass torts to sort through massive amounts of electronic discovery and medical records, but could the technology help lawyers identify the next big case?

Some legal tech startup companies, Darrow and Rain Intelligence, are doing just that.

“It’s actually quite remarkable,” attorney Katrina Carroll, who has been working with Darrow for more than four years, told Law.com. “It’s the volume of cases that they are able to identify that is unlike anything I’ve ever seen before.”

Scraping the Internet for consumer complaints, social media posts and government databases, both companies use AI-based business development tools to identify potential class actions, particularly in the areas of privacy,



Katrina Carroll, partner with Carroll Shamberg

price fixing, labor violations, product labeling and securities fraud.

“We have built the necessary evidence to be able to support a law firm in filing that claim with the court,” Darrow Chief Revenue Officer Mathew Lewis said of his Israel-based firm, which has signed up 80 plaintiffs’ firms as clients. Darrow has several investors, having raised \$35 million in 2023. His goal is to partner with plaintiffs’ firms to do some good and to improve the quality of cases, noting that many copycat lawsuits flood the courts.

Rain Intelligence CEO Mohammed Rashik said his firm’s goal is to make every lawyer a rainmaker so that she can focus instead on practicing law.

“We care about giving you the objective facts that could lead to potential liability, but we’re not in the business of recommending any sort of lawsuit on either plaintiff or defense side by giving our assessment on the merits of the case,” Rashik said. “We identify fact patterns that could

» Page 8

LAW.COM

EXPERIENCE THE NEW LAW.COM

PERFECT YOUR PRACTICE

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

ALM.

Legal Geek North America 2025: In-House Counsel Still Hoping For AI-Driven Shift To Fixed-Fee or Project-Based Billing

BY BENJAMIN JOYNER

FRUSTRATED general counsel and in-house team members make up a significant part of the audience at any legal tech conference, after years of hoping new tech would bring about broad acceptance of alternative fee arrangements to no avail. Legal Geek North America 2025 in Chicago was no exception, as GCs expressed a continued desire for changed pricing, and vendors offered products designed



Zhaoying (Dorothy) Du, head of the global supply chain legal team at Lenovo

to help firms switch to different billing models.

In a panel titled “The future of in-house legal: Partnerships, innovation, and efficiency in the AI era,” Zhaoying (Dorothy) Du, head of the global supply chain legal team at Lenovo, and Elizabeth Brown, general counsel, corporate secretary and chief administration officer at CSC Generation, discussed the challenges of the outside counsel relationship today.

Prominent among these is the feeling that clients are being charged repeatedly for what is often ultimately the same work. “We get billed anew for a document we know has existed and been around since the beginning of time,” Brown said.

This is exacerbated by a perception that firms have been slower than clients to adopt AI tools that might serve to make their work more efficient. “Outside counsel really needs to prove their value,” Brown said. “What I’m not hearing much right now ... is how are they using AI? How are they getting ahead of all of these innovations in the space?”

Du also noted that firms are often failing to exploit the areas where their advantages over in-house teams are greatest. “Because they work with so many clients, they’re more aware of industry trends,” she said, suggesting that proactive legislative

» Page 6

Expert Analysis

Action

« Continued from page 3

Boasberg thus interpreted the term induce to have its ordinary meaning—“influence to an act or course of conduct, lead by persuasion or reasoning, incite by motives, prevail on”—rather than a meaning that would require corrupt *quid-pro-quo* transactions.

Next, Boasberg addressed the definition of the term “remuneration” in the AKS, which Vertex contended refers only to “transactions that corrupt physicians’ and patients’ decision making.”

By utilizing two canons of statutory interpretation which together require that general words be understood in light of the more specific terms sur-

However, Vertex has filed an appeal of the district court’s decision, and time will tell whether the D.C. Circuit ultimately agrees with the Second and Fourth Circuits, or whether the D.C. Circuit creates a circuit split that the Supreme Court may decide to resolve.

Criminal Conviction for AKS Offenses Overturned Due to Government’s Failure to Show Intent to Influence Physician or Non-Physician Decision Makers

On April 14, 2025, in *United States v. Sorensen*, 134 F.4th 493 (7th Cir. 2025), the Seventh Circuit issued a decision emphasizing that, for an AKS criminal conviction to stand, the government must prove that the payments in question were either intended to influence physicians in their prescribing or ordering decisions, or, as relevant in the

positive, “a payee’s position can be relevant in determining the purpose of a payment.”

Turning to the facts in Sorensen’s case, the Seventh Circuit found no evidence that any of the entities Sorensen paid “leveraged any sort of informal power and influence over healthcare decisions.” Instead, the marketing companies provided only “advertising services” and the manufacturer merely made and distributed the braces.

None of these entities “authorized medical care” or “unduly influence[d] . . . doctors’ decisions.” In fact, according to the court, the physicians to whom the marketing companies sent pre-filled but unsigned prescription forms “retained full discretion to determine whether to prescribe” the DME requested.

Further in this regard, the Seventh Circuit pointed to what it saw as a critically important fact: that in Sorensen’s case, the physicians who received proposed DME prescriptions were not a “rubber stamp.”

To the contrary, such physicians often declined to sign or even return the proposed DME prescriptions, thereby showing that they “always had ultimate control over their patients’ healthcare choices and applied independent judgment in exercising that control.”

On these facts, the Seventh Circuit held that Sorensen’s conduct did not violate the AKS and reversed his conviction as a matter of law.

Notably, in its opinion, the court not only provided a useful conceptual framework for AKS cases involving payments to non-physicians, but also made several observations that may prove helpful in the future defense of AKS actions, such as: “aggressive advertising efforts are not equivalent to unlawful referrals of patients”; “[a]fter all, the purpose of advertising is to influence decision making”; the use of “percentage-based compensation structures” to distribute healthcare reimbursement proceeds amongst parties seeking to increase prescriptions “are not per se unlawful”; and such compensation structures can support an AKS violation only if “payments have . . . be[en] made in order to induce an unlawful referral.”

Government Files FCA Lawsuit Charging Major Health Insurers and Brokers with Paying for Beneficiaries to be Referred to Medicare Advantage Plans, and Discriminating Against Disabled Beneficiaries

The third and final matter discussed in this column is the most recent: a major FCA action in the District of Massachusetts in which the U.S. Department of Justice alleges that some of the country’s largest health insurers, acting together with insurance brokers, not only participated in a scheme to make unlawful payments for the referral of patients to the insurers’ Medicare Advantage plans, but also discriminated against disabled Medicare beneficiaries who were perceived to be less profitable.

The government’s complaint in partial intervention in the case—*United States ex rel. Shea v. eHealth, Inc. et al.*, 21-cv-11777 (DJC)—spans 213 pages and alleges eight causes of action, seven under the FCA, and one common law cause of action for unjust enrichment. Based on the docket, the case arises from a previously sealed action that a *qui tam* relator filed under the FCA in Nov. 2021.

The litigation of the *Shea* case is only in its initial stages, and as of at least Jan. 2025, the government’s investigation and final intervention decisions against two potential defendants were not yet complete.

Likewise, there have been no substantive filings or motions beyond the relator’s *qui tam* complaint and the government’s complaint in intervention. In fact, as of the writing of this article, counsel for the defendants have not yet filed notices of appearances.

However, because the government’s intervention in this FCA case took place during the current presidential administration, the matter appears to reflect the administration’s enforcement priorities and is an important development in the FCA arena.

Sorensen case, were intended to influence non-physicians who occupied “positions to ‘leverage fluid, informal power and influence’ over healthcare decisions.”

By contrast, payments to advertising firms, marketers, or others who lack the ability to exert influence over healthcare decisions may be legally insufficient to support an AKS conviction.

The decision in *Sorensen* arose from the government’s indictment, in September 2019, of Mark Sorensen and another co-defendant on one count of conspiring to violate the AKS and three counts of substantive AKS violations.

Sorensen was the owner and operator of SyMed, a company that distributed durable medical equipment (DME) to Medicare beneficiaries. To increase the volume of his business, Sorensen entered into an arrangement with a DME manufacturer, a billing agency, and two marketing companies.

These entities and their owners agreed to a plan by which they advertised orthopedic braces to patients, set up call centers so that agents of the marketing companies could contact and collect information from patients who were interested in the braces, and then sent pre-filled but not-yet signed prescriptions for orthopedic braces to the patients’ regular physicians.

If the physician signed a prescription, Sorensen and his company directed the DME manufacturer to ship a brace to the patient, and the billing company sent Medicare a claim for reimbursement.

Any funds paid by Medicare were then divided amongst Sorensen, the manufacturer, the billing company, and the marketing companies.

Following his conviction at trial of all counts against him, Sorensen appealed to the Seventh Circuit and argued, among other things, that the evidence elicited at trial was insufficient to make out an AKS violation.

More specifically, Sorensen argued that the advertising of medical supplies was lawful, as were the efforts to contact the physicians of consenting beneficiaries to obtain a potential prescription.

In addressing Sorensen’s appeal, the Seventh Circuit began by noting that the AKS “primarily targets payments to individuals with influence over or access to patients that lets them control or influence patients’ choices about medical care.”

The court observed that the typical AKS scenario involves “a physician who accepts money in exchange for sending patients to a particular healthcare provider such as a hospital or a specialist.”

The court noted, however, that the AKS “can reach non-physicians, as well,” and stated that one of “Congress’s concerns in enacting the statute [was] to broaden liability to reach operatives who leverage fluid, informal power and influence.”

The *Sorensen* court thus held that when assessing whether a payment is prohibited by the AKS, courts must determine whether the payor acted “with the intent to induce referrals from the payee,” and although the title or formal authority of the payee is not dis-

By contrast, payments to advertising firms, marketers, or others who lack the ability to exert influence over healthcare decisions may be legally insufficient to support an AKS conviction.

rounding them, Vertex argued that “remuneration” must be limited by the examples of “kickback, bribe, or rebate” in the AKS, which Vertex contended all share “an element of corruption.”

Boasberg noted in response that the ordinary meaning of “kickback” and “bribe” do not necessarily require corrupt intent, and “rebate” certainly does not connote dishonesty. Boasberg further added that “even accepting *arguendo* that kickbacks, bribes, and rebates are all necessarily corrupt transactions,” the language of the AKS indicates that those types of payments are merely examples of remuneration under the statute.

Further, Boasberg observed that Congress had made it clear when enacting the AKS that it intended the statute to prohibit “a broad scope of transactions.” Thus, Boasberg found, remuneration is best read to refer not only to corrupt payments; instead, the best reading of remuneration in the AKS is the ordinary one—any “[r]eward; recompense; [or] salary.”

Against this backdrop, Boasberg rejected Vertex’s arguments that the AKS reaches only corrupt transactions. To the contrary, Boasberg concluded that the AKS “forbids all forms of remuneration done with the purpose of inducing the purchase of federally reimbursable healthcare services, regardless of whether the remuneration or induced conduct is independently unlawful.”

Having thus addressed and rejected Vertex’s statutory arguments about the reach of the AKS, Boasberg turned next to the question of whether HHS reasonably determined that the Fertility Support Program would violate the law.

As for the remuneration element, the court concluded that providing patients with funds to offset the potentially negative effects of the chemotherapy treatments that are necessary before embarking on Vertex’s gene editing regimen is a “reward” or “recompense.”

And, regarding inducement, the court concluded that Vertex’s motive in removing the financial barrier to fertility preservation services was to change patients’ and physicians’ behavior and encourage them to select CASGEVY to treat their blood disorders.

Thus, Boasberg found, the elements of an AKS violation were satisfied, and HHS acted properly in determining that the Fertility Support Program was contrary to law.

The *Vertex* decision is not the first to reject a corrupt transaction requirement in the AKS, nor is it the first to uphold an HHS opinion concluding that financial assistance programs violate the statute.

In fact, in the context of direct payment assistance programs, both the Second and Fourth Circuits have addressed many of the same arguments Vertex advanced, and came to the same conclusion as Judge Boasberg – that the AKS does not require a finding of corrupt intent and “remuneration” does not need to corrupt medical decision-making. *Pfizer, Inc. v. HHS*, 42 F.4th 67 (2d Cir. 2022); *Pharmaceutical Coal. For Patient Access v. United States*, 126 F.4th 927 (2025).

Calendar of Events

TUESDAY JUNE 24

NY State Bar (CLE)

New York’s New Virtual Court
Appearance Platform - VCAP
<https://nysba.org/events/new-yorks-new-virtual-court-appearance-platform-vcap/>
1 CLE credit
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE)

Path to the Bench: How to Become a Judge
<https://nysba.org/events/path-to-the-bench-how-to-become-a-judge/>
Informational Program
Virtual

Practising Law Institute

Internal Investigations 2025
9 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
www.pli.edu/programs/internal-investigations/

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25

NY State Bar (Non CLE)

Beyond the Billable Hour: Planning Your Financial Future with Intention
<https://nysba.org/events/beyond-the-billable-hour-planning-your-financial-future-with-intention/>
Informational Program
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE)

Taking Aim at Vertical Mergers - a Twin or King-Sized Problem?
<https://nysba.org/events/taking-aim-at-vertical-mergers-a-twin-or-king-sized-problem/>
Informational Program
Virtual

NYC Bar

Careers in Labor & Employment Law
6 p.m. - 8 p.m.
Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SS062525&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom/42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25

Practising Law Institute
Ethics for In-House Corporate Counsel 2025
9 a.m. – 11:10 a.m.
www.pli.edu/programs/ethics-for-in-house-corporate-counsel/

Ethics in Discovery 2025

12 p.m. – 2:10 p.m.
www.pli.edu/programs/ethics-in-discovery/

Ethics Game Show 2025: A

Review of Ethical Issues
3 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.
www.pli.edu/programs/the-ethics-game-show/

Nassau Community College

FDR and his clashes with the US Supreme Court
3 PM
WHPC Radio 90.3 FM
Voice stream or Podcast anytime

Vishing

« Continued from page 5

Firms present an attractive target “one, because of the secrets that we keep as lawyers and law firms and clients that we represent,” Waller said.

“Secondly, I think that there is the fact that we are seen as being a place where they can make money ... they view law firms as a lucrative target.”

The danger to firms is compounded by the nature of the partnership model and legal work. Unlike top-down enterprises, where it can be easier to impose a uniform cybersecurity posture on all employees, partners and practice groups are often used to operating with some level of autonomy, creating inconsistencies in cybersecurity practices.

Dangers and Solutions

Date breaches like those carried out by the SRG can be particularly damaging to law firms, given

www.NCCradio.org

THURSDAY, JUNE 26

NY State Bar (Non CLE)

Creating Calm with Emotional Freedom Techniques
<https://nysba.org/events/creating-calm-with-emotional-freedom-techniques-session-4/>
Informational Program
Virtual

NYC Bar (CLE)

16-Hour Bridge-the-Gap: Practical Skills, Ethics & More...
Time Day 1: 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
Time Day 2: 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
16 CLE credits for Both Days
Day 1: 8 CLE credits
Day 2: 8 CLE credits
Both Days Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB62425B&mcode=NYLJ
Day 1 Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB062425&mcode=NYLJ
Day 2 Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB062625&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

NYC Bar (Non CLE)

Small Firm Chats – Stay Connected with Your Peers and Us!
12 p.m. - 12:45 p.m.
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLFC062625&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org
New York City Bar Chorus Benefit Concert
7 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CHOR062625&mcode=NYLJ>
42 West 44th Street, New York
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, JUNE 26

FRIDAY, JUNE 27

Practising Law Institute
Compliance & Ethics Essentials 2025
9 a.m. – 5 p.m. (Day 1)
9 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. (Day 2)
www.pli.edu/programs/compliance--ethics-essentials/

FRIDAY, JUNE 27

NY State Bar (Non CLE)

Mindful Moments Meditation
<https://nysba.org/events/6-27-25-mindful-moments-meditation-series/>
Informational Program
Virtual

NYC Bar

Senior Lawyers Chatroom
12 p.m. - 1 p.m.
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SEN062725&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SEN062725&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org
New York City Bar Chorus Benefit Concert
7 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CHOR062725&mcode=NYLJ>
42 West 44th Street, New York
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, JULY 10-SATURDAY, JULY 12

NY State Bar (CLE)

Family Law Summer Meeting in Saratoga
<https://nysba.org/events/family-law-section-2025-summer-meeting-in-saratoga/>
6 CLE credits
Saratoga Springs

FRIDAY, JULY 11

NY State Bar

A Day at the Races: Trial Lawyers Section Member Social
<https://nysba.org/events/a-day-at-the-races-trial-lawyers-section-member-social/>
Saratoga Springs

FRIDAY, JULY 11-SUNDAY, JULY 13

NY State Bar (CLE)

Tax Section Summer Meeting at Crystal Springs Resort, NJ
<https://nysba.org/events/tax-section-2025-summer-meeting/>
5 CLE credits
Hamburg, NJ

TUESDAY JULY 15

NY State Bar (CLE)

Recent Cryptocurrency Issues
<https://nysba.org/events/recent-cryptocurrency-issues/>
1 CLE credit
Virtual

THURSDAY, JULY 17-SATURDAY, JULY 19

NY State Bar

Elder Law and Special Needs Section Summer Meeting in Baltimore
<https://nysba.org/events/elder-law-and-special-needs-section-summer-2025-meeting/>
Baltimore, MD

THURSDAY, JULY 17-SUNDAY, JULY 20

NY State Bar (CLE)

Real Property Law Section Summer Meeting at Crystal Springs Resort, NJ
<https://nysba.org/events/real-property-law-section-summer-meeting-2025/>
6.5 CLE credits
Hamburg, NJ

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



Point Your Career in the Right Direction.

Find the right position today.
Visit lawjobs.com | Your hiring partner

ALM. | lawjobs.com

Outside Counsel / Technology Today

Family Court

« Continued from page 4

case complained that her attorney should have retained a medical witness to rebut evidence establishing the cause of the child’s injuries. But the mother’s complaint was impermissibly based on speculation that exculpatory opinion evidence could have been offered.

A recent decision in a custody case denying an IAC claim was based on both impermissible speculation and counsel’s apparent reasonable tactic. The reviewing court in *Matter of Candy II. v Kandice HH.*, 236 AD3d 1156 (3d Dept 2025), was unpersuaded by the grandmother’s argument that she received IAC based on counsel opening the door to her wrongful acts against her daughter decades earlier.

The grandmother’s “hindsight speculation” was deemed insufficient to undermine the viability of counsel’s strategy of trying to establish the relationship between the grandmother and the children. That approach turned out to be “less than perfect,” but it was not the role of the reviewing court to second-guess counsel’s approach.

Finally, IAC claims are often rejected where they are based on the absence of a motion or argument that had little or no chance of success (*see e.g. Matter of Anavias D. [Jason D.]*, 234 AD3d 1370, 1370-1371 [4th Dept 2025]); *Matter of Neferteir A.R. [Jesse R.R.]*, 221 AD3d 605, 606-607 [2d Dept 2023]).

While this article focuses on representation of adults, note an interesting juvenile delinquency case. A compelling concurrence in *Matter of A. WW.*, 237 AD3d 1420 (3d Dept 2025), opines that respondent received IAC where his attorney had him admit to the charge and did not move to dismiss the petition in furtherance of justice. Despite being psychiatrically cleared, the respondent

remained in hospital detention for six months; and a JD proceeding was initiated to find a suitable placement for the mentally ill youth—rather than because such a proceeding was appropriate based on the conduct at issue.

Cases Finding IAC

While appellate courts typically decline to find IAC in Family Court matters, there are cases where counsel’s performance has been deemed constitutionally defective. In general, counsel’s omissions in those cases fall into three main categories, that is, the failure to: communicate with the client; vigorously or appropriately litigate at hearings; and investigate or introduce dispositive evidence.

Failure to Communicate with Client. *Matter of Orneika J.*, 112 AD2d 78, 80 (1st Dept 1985), involves a mother who was psychiatrically hospitalized at the time of the termination of parental rights (TPR) hearing. Her attorney remained mute during trial, informing the court that he had been unable to communicate with her prior to trial. The First Department held that the mother was deprived of her right to counsel, noting that her attorney had not even been in contact with her during her hospitalization.

The Third Department similarly found IAC where counsel for a father on a visitation modification proceeding did not communicate with him prior to the proceeding. In *Matter of Mitchell v Childs*, 26 AD3d 685, 686-687 (3d Dept 2006), the petitioner father was represented by the Public Defender’s office, and multiple members of the office appeared by his side in court without having spoken to him beforehand.

This lack of communication ultimately led to the dismissal of the petition based on the failure to allege a sufficient change of circumstances. The Third Department also noted that the deficiency could have been remedied by an amended pleading. At a minimum,

effective assistance of counsel in Family Court cases includes communication with the client before court appearances (*see generally* Rules of Prof Conduct [22 NYCRR 1200.0], rule 1.4).

A variation of this concept occurred in *Matter of Eileen R. (Carmine S.)*, 79 AD3d 1482 (3d Dept 2010). There, during a TPR hearing, appellant’s counsel declined to request opportunities to confer with his client, who was not present in court. Nor did counsel object

Reviewing courts are typically reluctant to second-guess counsel’s trial strategy. Yet there are cases where the Appellate Division has found that not offering particular evidence constituted ineffective representation.

to the court’s pre-assignment ruling forbidding testimony via phone, which effectively prevented the client from presenting any evidence in his defense.

The Third Department deemed these lapses to support an IAC finding and held that the client’s due process rights were violated.

Similarly, in *Matter of Kendra M.*, 175 AD2d 657 (4th Dept 1991), counsel failed to ensure that the incarcerated client was produced and to object to the TPR proceeding being held in her absence. While the court stopped short of deeming counsel’s errors to be IAC, it wrote that, “[w]e conclude that the adequacy of counsel’s representation was questionable,” and what occurred thus violated the parent’s due process rights (*id.* at 658).

Failure to Reasonably Litigate. Where an attorney falls short in not advocating for the client during contested proceedings or making significant errors that cannot be rationalized as strategic actions, courts have found IAC warranting reversal. It is not difficult to imagine that the utter failure to offer any evidence or argument on behalf of a client could be deemed IAC.

But in *Matter of Nicholas GG.*, 285 AD2d 678 (3d Dept 2001), the court

found such conduct acceptable at a TPR fact-finding hearing. The court drew the line, however, at counsel’s subsequent lapse in not presenting any proof or arguments on her behalf at the dispositional hearing, finding that to have been IAC (*id.* at 680).

Similarly, in *Matter of Wood v Rebich*, 166 AD3d 1416 (3d Dept 2018), the court wrote: “In short, counsel did almost nothing to assist his client,” including opening or closing statements, cross-

examination, introducing evidence or calling witnesses, and making virtually no objections.

Courts—particularly the Third Department—sometimes delve into specific mistakes by counsel at contested hearings. For instance, in *Matter of William O. v. Michele A.*, 119 AD3d 990, 991-992 (3d Dept 2014), the father’s attorney in a custody modification proceeding did not object to the court’s improper reliance on the Attorney for the Child as an investigative arm of the court and advisor, which the appellate court deemed IAC.

In *Matter of Aaron OO. (Amber PP.)*, 170 AD3d 1436, 1437 (3d Dept 2019), counsel spent a large amount of time questioning witnesses about matters irrelevant to the issue at hand in the visitation proceeding, such as the mother’s financial situation and a child from a different relationship.

Finally, *Matter of Jaikob O. (William O.)*, 88 AD3d 1075, 1077-1078 (3d Dept 2011), provides a particularly egregious example of this type of scenario. In that case, the court wrote that “counsel’s ineffectiveness permeated the proceedings.”

The errors included engaging in irrelevant and inappropriate cross-examination and failing to make an

opening statement or closing argument, to object to an oral motion that was required to be in writing, and to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law as directed by the court.

Notably, counsel also discouraged his client from seeking a new attorney, and unethically threatened that he would not communicate with the new attorney or send case-related materials to the client if he pursued that option.

Failure to Present Dispositive Evidence. As noted above, reviewing courts are typically reluctant to second-guess counsel’s trial strategy. Yet there are cases where the Appellate Division has found that not offering particular evidence constituted ineffective representation. In general, the Appellate Division has been more apt to engage in such analysis in cases involving findings of a willful violation of a child support order, perhaps because incarceration can result from such a finding.

For instance, in *Matter of Nassau County Dept. of Social Servs. v King*, 149 AD3d 942, 943-946 (2d Dept 2017), the father asserted that he had not paid child support due to his mental illness and resulting inability to work. Despite being informed by the Support Magistrate that the father would need to submit medical proof at the hearing to rebut the presumption of willfulness, his attorney failed to obtain the father’s medical records or subpoena any treating professional. This failure resulted in a finding of willfulness.

The Third Department reached a similar conclusion in *Matter of Templeton v Templeton*, 74 AD3d 1513, 1514 (3d Dept 2010), where the court’s ruling turned on the father’s inability to work after a car accident and the attorney’s failure to introduce any evidence to support that argument (*see also Matter of McCloskey*, 231 AD3d 1031 [2d Dept 2024]).

Finally, an additional basis for finding counsel’s performance unacceptable does not fit within any of the above categories. As

articulated in the criminal court context, counsel’s failure to file a timely notice of appeal may constitute IAC for which relief should be available (*see e.g. People v Syville*, 15 NY3d 391, 397-400 [2010] [on common law writs of error coram nobis, defendants were allowed to pursue direct appeals where ineffective counsel did not file notices of appeal as the defendants had requested]).

In the Family Court context, there is no statutory grace period to file a late notice of appeal, and coram nobis relief—to allow for consideration of an appeal, despite counsel’s failure to take an appeal within the Family Ct Act § 1113 jurisdictional time limit—although technically an available remedy is granted extremely rarely.

One of those rare cases is *Matter of Ricardo T., Jr. (Ricardo T. Sr.)*, 172 AD3d 732 (2d Dept 2019). In that case, the father moved in Family Court to vacate orders terminating his parental rights. The Second Department reversed and granted the motion, holding that his attorney’s failure to file a timely notice of appeal was ineffective—albeit without naming coram nobis as the legal basis for such outcome.

It is incumbent upon trial counsel to discuss with the client whether to take an appeal, to do so if the client wishes—and to seek assignment of appellate counsel for an eligible client. That critical final step is often overlooked, resulting in long delays in appeals moving forward. Yet this task can be done easily by completing and submitting the one-page Certification of Continued Indigency form found It is incumbent upon trial counsel to discuss with the client whether to take an appeal, to do so if the client wishes—and to seek assignment of appellate counsel for an eligible client. That critical final step is often overlooked on Appellate Division websites. Effective trial counsel preserves each Family Court client’s right to appeal and facilitates their right to the assignment of appellate counsel.

Armed

« Continued from page 5

the defendant’s novel argument that the source code was the declarant.

The court noted that even if the TrueAllele system is programmed to have some measure of “artificial intelligence,” the source code is not an entity that can be cross-examined.

The court noted that, “[T]he Confrontation Clause provides two types of protection for a criminal defendant: the right physically to face those who testify against him, and the right to conduct cross-examination” (*Coy v Iowa*, 487 US 1012, 1017 [1988], *quoting Pennsylvania v Ritchie*, 480 US 39, 51 [1987 plurality]). *People v Wakefield*, 38 N.Y.3d 367, 385 (2022, DiFiori, C.J.)

In *People v Burrus*, the court denied the defendant’s motion to preclude DNA evidence.

The court determined that the defendant was not entitled to the preclusion of the Forensic Statistical Tool (FST) evidence under the *Frye* standard because the use of a probabilistic genotyping software was generally accepted in the rel-

evant scientific community as reliable which was an advancement of the semi-continuous ones like the FST and even the defense’s expert did not testify that the testing was unreliable.

In *Burrus*, an expert testified that that FST would not fall under a narrower definition of AI as it does not use machine learning, neuronets or decision trees and does not have an aspect of sensing the environment. *People v Burrus*, 81 Misc. 3d 550, 622 (Sup. Ct. Kings Co. 2023, Chun, J.)

Further, in *Matter of Phila. Ins. Indem. Co. v. Kendall*, 197 A.D.3d 75, 76 (1st Dept., 2021, Moulton, J.), the Appellate Division noted that just as a party may attack a hard copy settlement offer or acceptance as a forgery, a party that claims an email was the product of a hacker or of artificial intelligence, or of some other source may rebut its authenticity.

Moreover, significantly for the legal practitioners, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit recognized, an attempt to persuade a court or oppose an adversary by relying on “non-existent precedent generated by ChatGPT” is an “abuse of the adversary system.” *Park*

v. Kim, 91 F.4th 610, 615 (2d Cir. 2024, Per Curium) (*quoting Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443, 461 (S.D.N.Y. 2023, Castel, J.)).

The AI technology behind deepfakes is advanced and complex, making it difficult for the average person to detect the falsity of a deepfake.

Lawyers who have engaged in this abusive practice have been subject to sanctions. *See Mata*, 678 F. Supp. 3d at 464-66 (imposing sanctions, including a \$5,000 penalty, on two attorneys and a law firm in connection with their submission to the court of nonexistent cases generated by ChatGPT); *see also Park*, 91 F.4th at 615-16 (referring attorney who submitted a brief with a nonexistent case generated by ChatGPT to the court’s Grievance Panel). *Dukuray v. Experian Info. Sols.*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 132667 (S.D.N.Y. 2024, Stein, J.).

In *Andersen v. Stability AI Ltd.*, 700 F. Supp. 3d 853 (N.D. C.A. 2023, Orrick, J.) (granting motion to dismiss with leave to amend), “the artists complained about computer models with artificial intel-

ligence capabilities trained on their work, alleging that these companies were stealing their work by reproducing it and creating similar works of a kind the artist would

make, thereby “represent[ing] ‘unfair competition against.’” *Lawrence v. Fincity Corp.*, 716 F. Supp. 3d 851, 879 (E.D. CA. 2024, Calabretta, J.).

Robust Response To AI Armed Criminals

A robust response by law enforcement and private industry is necessary to counter the proliferation of IA scams. For example, according to past testimony by Facebook’s General Counsel in a United States Senate hearing, Facebook has employed a multilayered strategy to enforce its terms of service policies and combat extremist content on its platform.

Terrorist photos or videos that users attempts to upload are matched against an inventory of

known terrorist content. Facebook uses artificial intelligence to block or remove “text that might be advocating for terrorism.”

When Facebook detects terrorist-related content, it also uses artificial intelligence to identify similar, socially interconnected accounts, content, and pages that may themselves support terrorism. *Force v. Facebook, Inc.*, 934 F.3d 53, 60 (2nd Cir. 2019, Droney, J.).

As Chief Judge Robin Rosenbaum of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has stated: “To ‘keep pace with the inexorable march of technological progress,’ *United States v. Warshak*, 631 F.3d 266, 285 (6th Cir. 2010), we must be confident that a video or photograph is truly what it purports to be before accepting it as gospel.

Some of today’s smart phones, like the Google Pixel—with its “Magic Eraser” feature—can edit or erase persons and objects from photographs with a couple of clicks and replace them with AI-generated imagery that fills the gap.

Similar technology, I am sure, will likely soon be available for the editing of videos. Indeed, there are reports that the next version of

“Magic Eraser” will allow users of Google Pixel phones to remove audio (like background noise) from videos. *See* Brad Linder, *Audio Magic Eraser Feature May Debut With the Google Pixel 8* (Liliputing—Aug. 12, 2023).” *Brooks v. Miller*, 78 F.4th 1267, 1286 (11th Cir. 2023, Rosenbaum, C.J.).

Conclusion

The cases demonstrate that the malevolent use of artificial intelligence jeopardizes individuals and organizations confronting them with unnecessary risks while undermining the virtues of emerging technology.

While cybercrime in all its evolving forms is on the rise necessitating the need for significant awareness and effective cybersecurity measures, the use of AI in cybercrime is also evolving, and increasing with offenders employing AI-generated content to deceive victims and enrich themselves.

Unfortunately, the introduction of AI into cybercrime schemes enhances the offender’s ability to prey on the unwary in a direct, expedited, large scale and automated manner.

Class Action

« Continued from page 5

indicate liability, and we provide that information to our customers.”

So, How Does It Work?

In mass torts, Darrow is especially focused on medical liability or pharmaceuticals and environmental cases. Lewis said there are government databases about pesticide use that can be cross-referenced with medical reporting of cancer rates, or social media posts about skin rashes, for instance. This month, Darrow partnered with Mamavation, a community-based environmental organization that researches toxins in consumer products.

“You start to bring these layers of data together and specifically identify where there’s enough correlation to start your investigation,” Lewis said. “You’re pulling a whole host of publicly available information together that is disconnected and layering that in a

geo-intelligence tool to see how it’s happening all in one place.”

In one example, Lewis said, Darrow identified a cancer cluster in a community in California’s Smith River, known for growing Easter lilies, where there was a high use of pesticides known as TriCal.

And filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission could reveal whether certain pension fund investments are underperforming. In the past 12 months, Lewis said, his firm has identified \$5.5 billion in potential damages across 30 cases.

“In very tangible terms, those cases would put \$2 billion back into retirement employee accounts,” Lewis said. “The numbers are just massive. That’s one area of technological application where it would have been near impossible for a law firm to do this manually.”

Carroll, who earlier this year started her own firm, Chicago-based Carroll Shamberg, said Darrow was able to flag privacy concerns involving the dating apps Bumble and Badoo. That prompted

a class action she filed against parent company Bumble Inc., which settled last year for \$40 million. Class members are set to receive payments in the coming weeks, she said.

“Working with them has allowed me to file cases that would’ve taken way longer from the initial conception phase though the investigation, and finding a plaintiff, which would normally be a process that would take months,” Carroll said. “So they’ve really allowed me to file cases that would take a long time to file, or, in some cases, would never possibly be filed at all.”

Rashik, at Rain Intelligence, said his firm combs complaints with the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to identify widespread automobile defects. His AI tools also scour Amazon reviews or Reddit comments.

“If you look at product labeling data, and see some product is being advertised in a certain way that’s inconsistent with what’s on the label, that can lead to a false

advertising case,” Rashik said.

Predict Litigation Before It’s Filed’

It is a far cry from the traditional way to identify new class actions, which was primarily through an established network of other lawyers, Carroll said. Other ways were through manually sorting through consumer complaints, calls coming into law firms or an attorney simply noticing something that appeared to be fraudulent.

“We’re very busy, and have built a nice book of business, or book of cases, through those means,” Carroll said.

But Darrow’s technology, Carroll said, is groundbreaking.

For instance, Darrow has helped Carroll find privacy violations in the healthcare space by locating medical information provided by a patient on a hospital’s website that ends up in the hands of tech companies.

The AI tools are particularly helpful for lawyers starting out in their careers. Rashik, a graduate of

what is now called the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco, started out as a solo practitioner before founding San Francisco-based Rain Intelligence in 2021.

“I realized the first thing you need is clients,” Rashik said. “And I didn’t have any clients, didn’t have a way to get clients. It seems like you could at the time advertise or be a really good networker. So I started thinking to myself, ‘why isn’t there a data-driven, systematic way to get new clients for my law firm?’ Based on that, what we first started doing was using AI to predict litigation before it’s filed.”

But it’s not just plaintiffs’ lawyers interested in identifying future class actions.

Rashik said that defense firms representing the same company could use Rain Intelligence’s services to alert their clients to potentially new class actions, while at the same time gaining a competitive advantage.

J. Simone Jones, a partner at Sidley Austin in the Am Law

100 firm’s Washington D.C. and Chicago offices who defends companies against toxic tort and product liability matters, said AI could be useful for the defense to disprove allegations, such as whether certain representations were made to specific geographic populations or over designated periods of time.

However, Jones acknowledged that the technology is sure to encourage more plaintiffs’ lawyers to enter the field of class actions, while, at the same time, generating new types of cases, many of which historically might have flown under the radar.

“We don’t seem to be there yet,” Jones said. “But the more accessible AI becomes, the more user-friendly it becomes, the more capability it has to do these types of analyses, you’ll see it more. Darrow and Rain are just some early entrants to this market, but I think you’re going to see more and more given the potential it has to increase lawsuits.”

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

Need a smart Expert Witness?
ALMExperts has leaders in every discipline.

www.almexperts.com • 888-809-0133

ONE SOURCE that includes:

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

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION

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

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

10 A.M.

952142/23 Bowman v. Cosby

1 P.M.

21323/19 Padilla v. Riverbay Corporation

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25

10 A.M.

800456/21 Toure v. 88 Wall Street

12 P.M.

157620/22 Thompson Holcombe LLC v. Huteau

2 P.M.

809498/22 Regalado v. Guity

THURSDAY, JUNE 26

10 A.M.

655981/24 Paltzer v. Hejailan-Amon

12 P.M.

806661/22 Cabral v. Alcaín

FRIDAY, JUNE 27

1 P.M.

651452/24 Akerman LLP v. Iler

MONDAY, JUNE 30

10 A.M.

654015/21 Aywid Realty v. Duman

12 P.M.

819613/23 Anglero v. Matos

TUESDAY, JULY 1

10 A.M.

659157/24 Viola Credit v. Landa Holdings

TUESDAY, JULY 8

10 A.M.

1100/13 In the Matter of the Application of Jasmine Bullard

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9

10 A.M.

320348/20 Rosenblatt v. Rosenblatt

FRIDAY, JULY 11

9:30 A.M.

650756/24 Cowen & Company v. ReKTGlobal Holding

12:30 P.M.

655910/24 ACM Zoomcar v. Zoomcar Holdings

3:30 P.M.

850031/25 Santander Bank v. 558 West 151st Street

54 Schecter: 228 (60 Centre)
55 d'Auguste: 103 (71 Thomas)
56 Kelly: 204 (71 Thomas)
57 Kraus: 218 (60 Centre)
58 Cohen, D.: 305 (71 Thomas)
60 Crane: 248 (60 Centre)
61 Bannon: 232 (60 Centre)
59 James, D.: 331 (60 Centre)
62 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)

MFPKahn: 1127B (111 Centre)
MMSP-1: 1127B (111 Centre)
IDV Dawson: 1604 (100 Centre)

PART 40TR

JUDICIAL MEDIATION

On Rotating Schedule

Adams 300 (60 Centre)

EARLY SETTLEMENT

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

SPECIAL REFEREES

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

JHO/SPECIAL REFEREES

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

SPECIAL REFEREE

71 Thomas Street

Judicial Hearing Officers

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

SUPREME COURT

Motion Calendars

Room 130, 9:30 A.M.

60 Centre Street

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

Motion Calendar Key:

ADJ—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Courtroom (Room 130).
ARG—Scheduled for argument for date and part indicated.
SUB (PT #)—Motion was submitted to part noted.
WDN—Motion was withdrawn on calendar call.
SUB/DEF—Motion was submitted on default to part indicated.
APB (All Papers By)—This motion is adjourned to Room 119 on date indicated, only for submission of papers.

SUBM 3—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Court Room (Room 130) for affirmation or so ordered stipulation.
S—Stipulation.
C—Consent.
C MOTION—Adjourned to Commercial Motion Part Calendar.

FINAL—Adjournment date is final

60 CENTRE STREET

Submissions Part

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

Submission

1 100535/25 Amis v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
2 800312/11 Caracci v. Mount Sinai Medical Center
3 100005/25 Davis v. Lidl

THURSDAY, JUNE 26

Submission

1 100465/24 Booker v. Jennings
2 101356/24 Evans v. Sharpe

Paperless Judge Part

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

850197/19106e101 Hldgs. LLC v. 106 East 101 St. LLC
156542/25 140 Lex LLC v. Anb Rlty. Corp.
653368/25140 Schermerhorn St. Prop. Owner LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Boerum Condominium

653148/23 180 Remsen LLC v. St. Francis College Et Al
652441/2523 Canal St. LLC Et Al v. Eic Rlty.
157014/19 393beekman Pl. Corp. v. Lions Gate NY LLC
160652/24451 West 46th St. Rlty. LLC v. Rutilio Palacios

652159/25510 East 6th St. LLC v. Perez
850165/2357th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc. By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Miller
652566/25722 Metro. LLC v. Seneca Ins. Co., Inc.

850011/13938 St. Nicholas Ave. v. 936-938 Cliffcrest Housing
850639/23 Aareal Capital Corp. Et Al v. 462bdwy Land
157531/24 Access Group Loan Reserve Trust 1 v. Kim
651290/24 Admiral Indemnity Co. A/s/o M At Beekman Condominium And The Board of Mgrs. of M At Beekman Condominium v. Matison Plumbing & Heating Co. Inc. Et Al

151599/20 Aguilar v. Tmp Wireless, Inc.
151599/20 Aguilar v. Tmp Wireless, Inc.

BROOKLYN BAR ASSOCIATION

Ratings of Judicial Candidates

The Brooklyn Bar Association has rated the following candidates in the upcoming election. Candidates receive one of three ratings: Approved, Not Approved or Not Approved for Failure to Participate.

For Civil Court

Janice Chen: Approved
Janice Purvis: Approved
Marisa Arrabito: Approved
Susan Liebman: Approved

NEW YORK CITY BAR

Ratings of Judicial Candidates

New York, June 12, 2025 - The New York City Bar Association has completed evaluations of the following candidates who are running in contested primary elections on June 24 for Civil Court in New York City. The review was conducted by the Association's Judiciary Committee.

The City Bar uses two ratings: Approved and Not Approved. Candidates rated Approved have affirmatively demonstrated qualifications necessary for the performance of the duties of the position for which they are being considered.

Bronx County Civil Court, County-wide

Shekera Anessa Algarin: Approved
George M. Santana: Not Approved

Kings County Civil Court, County-wide

Susan Liebman: Not Approved
Marisa Arrabito: Approved
Janice P. Purvis: Approved
Janice Chen: Approved

Queens County Civil Court, County-wide

John J. Ciafone: Not Approved
Sheridan C. Chu: Approved

Civil Court, 1st Municipal Court District

Juliette-Noor Haji: Approved
Thomas G. Wright-Fernandez: Not Approved

Civil Court, 2nd Municipal Court District

Eve Cho Guillergan: Approved
Julie M. Milner: Not Approved

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Is Accepting Applications for Western District Bankruptcy Judge

Application Deadline is Aug. 7

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit invites applications from qualified candidates for a 14-year appointment as United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Western District of New York, with a duty station in Rochester, New York. The selection process will be confidential and competitive. Applicants will be considered without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, sexual orientation, or disability.

The current annual salary of a United States Bankruptcy Judge is \$227,608.

The Second Circuit uses an open and competitive selection process. All applications are screened by 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 of which 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 August 7, 2025.

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Is Accepting Applications for Eastern District Bankruptcy Judge

Application Deadline is Aug. 7

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit invites applications from qualified candidates for a 14-year appointment as United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Eastern District of New York. There are two vacancies in the Eastern District of New York, one in Brooklyn and one in Central Islip. Applicants should identify in their cover letter whether they wish to be considered for Brooklyn, Central Islip, or both. The selection process will be confidential and competitive. Applicants will be considered without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, sexual orientation, or disability.

The current annual salary of a United States Bankruptcy Judge is \$227,608.

The Second Circuit uses an open and competitive selection process. All applications are screened by 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 of which 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 August 7, 2025.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT

Criminal Justice Act Committee Is Accepting Applications

Deadline is Sept. 8

The Criminal Justice Act Committee of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York is accepting new applications for appointment, and applications for reappointment, to the panel of attorneys under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, through September 8, 2025. The Court encourages highly qualified and experienced criminal defense attorneys who reflect the diversity of the community to apply for membership on the CJA Panel for the District. Assignments to the Panel will be for a three-year period, beginning January 1, 2026. Applicants must be admitted and in good standing to practice in the Eastern District of New York.

Applications may be submitted for assignment to the Brooklyn or Central Islip panels, or both. The Committee is also seeking applications from practitioners whose experience is uniquely suited to handling petitions for post-conviction relief.

All application forms, instructions, and submission information are available on the Court's website at: <https://www.nyed.uscourts.gov/criminal-justice-act-info>

New applications and applications for reappointment, along with all supporting documents, must be submitted in one flattened PDF file, no later than September 8, 2025, by electronic submission via the Court's website.

Please contact the Clerk of Court at 718-613-2270 if you experience difficulty uploading an application.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT

Re-Appointment of Incumbent Magistrate Judge Ona T. Wang

The current term of the office of United States Magistrate Judge Ona T. Wang is due to expire on March 4, 2026. The United States District Court is required by law to establish a panel of citizens to consider the reappointment of a magistrate judge to a new eight-year term.

The duties of a magistrate judge position include the following: (1) conduct of most preliminary proceedings in criminal cases; (2) trial and disposition of misdemeanor cases; (3) conduct of various pretrial matters and evidentiary proceedings on delegation from the judges of the district court; and (4) trial and disposition of civil cases upon consent of the litigants.

Comments from members of the bar and the public are invited as to whether the incumbent Magistrate Judge Ona T. Wang should be recommended by the panel for reappointment by the court, and should be directed to:

Edward Friedland
District Executive
U.S. Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, Room 820
New York, NY 10007-1312

Comments must be received by 30 days from date of notice.

NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

Deadline for Amicus Curiae Motions in 'Onondaga County v. State of New York'

The Court has calendared appeals in 'Onondaga County v. State of New York' (APL 2025-00088) for argument on September 8, 2025. Appellants' briefs are due by June 12, 2025. Respondents' briefs are due by July 10, 2025. Appellants' reply briefs are due by July 24, 2025.

Motions for permission to file a brief amicus curiae must be served no later than August 5, 2025 and noticed for a return date no later than August 18, 2025.

Questions may be directed to the Clerk's Office at (518) 455-7705.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER OF THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Pursuant to article VI, § 28(c) of the New York State Constitution and section 211 of the Judiciary Law, upon consultation with the Administrative Board of the Courts, and with the approval of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, I hereby amend, effective July 7, 2025, sections 24.6(g), (n) and 25.18 of the Rules of the Chief Judge, by adding the underlined material and removing the [bracketed] material, to read as follows:

PART 24. TIME AND LEAVE

Section 24.6. Other Leaves With Pay

(g) Conferences. Four days' leave per annum with-

Continued on page 10

656864/17 Ai Int'l Hldgs. v. Weinstein
155396/24 Alaneli v. 123 Washington LLC Et Al
150257/23 American Express Nat. Bank v. Gindi
653762/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Raymond Morel Et Al
651081/21 Augustinpartners LLC v. Okun & Churneefsky
850364/24 Axios Bank v. Cohly
160560/22 Barros v. Bokonos 243
651509/25 Benevolent And Protective Order of Elks of The U.S. of America v. Swiss Re Corporate Solutions Elite Ins. Corp.
651349/25 Bernstein v. Kia America, Inc. Et Al
190052/25 Blakely v. Aerco Int'l
656401/22 Board of Mgrs. of 165 E. 62nd St. Condominium v. Churchill E 62nd LLC Et Al
151103/23 Bolouvi v. Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. Et Al
155552/20 Boragi v. First Lexington Corp.
150876/25 Brend Restoration LLC v. 527 Greenwich LLC Et Al
158705/20 Cain v. Long Island RR.
151893/20 Carlisle v. One Hudson Yards Owner
190177/25 Castellucci v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co., Et Al
158665/24 Cavalry Spv Iv, Farrell
655578/24 Certain Underwriters At Lloyd's London Et Al v. Todaro Brothers Inc.
657110/21 Cirillo v. Green Crown LLC A/a Green Crown 669
850023/20 Citimortgage, Inc. v. Maccioni
652502/17 Colonial Funding Network, Inc. v. Kitchen Cabinet Refacers
158309/17 Colt v. New Jersey Transit
656011/23 Continental Casualty Co. v. Skidmore
161063/19 Contreras v. NYC
453156/24 Daar v. Selene Finance Lp Et Al
155984/21 Dan v. Verschleiser
161232/23 Daquilema v. Efin Mgt. Corp. Et Al
157576/22 Delacruz v. Atlantic Chestnut I Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
150908/25 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
952160/23 Doe v. NYC Et Al
152014/25 Doe v. Combs
650956/25 Elite Clinical Network v. Nema Research, Inc.
653290/24 Elkins v. Williams Pt P.C. Et Al
655905/20 Escrown LLC v. Arepas NYC Corp.
159092/24 Fairfax Financial Hldgs. Ltd. Et Al v. Exis Capital Mgt., Inc. Et Al
656381/23 Fedex Corporate Services, Inc. v. Javier The Jeweler Co. LLC Dba Javie The Jeweler Co.

155895/25 Flusberg v. Sanberg
190001/21 Frances McGowan v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
156285/24 Frank v. Teddy's Rlty. Associates
161817/24 Gafur v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
157512/22 Garcia-Guzman v. 200 East 16th St. Housing Corp. Et Al
654525/16 Gelwan v. Deratafia
650374/23 Gilbert v. Winston
850109/23 Goldberg v. Rizk M.D.
100369/23 Gray v. Nassau Life Ins. Co.
156378/21 Hernandez v. 331 W. 38th St. LLC Et Al
850255/23 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Doyle
653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
151391/22 Holguin v. 75 First Ave. Club of NY LLC Et Al
150763/25 Isufi v. Alan Ripka And Associates
950701/21 Jeffries v. Riverside Hawks A/a Riverside Hawks
152478/23 Jody Simmons v. NYCTA Et Al
850309/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Tip Top Tenth Ave. Mgt., Inc. Et Al
156799/22 Justine Ayala v. Cm And Associates Const. Mgt. Ltd. Liability Co. Et Al
100351/22 Kellinger v. Fox Media LLC Et Al
152154/22 Kelly v. Pasta La Vista, Inc. Et Al
152910/25 Klein v. Beechwood Merrick LLC Et Al
156645/241. & B Apparel LLC v. Amini
150806/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Pension Fund Et Al
805355/17 Lin v. Chan
850683/23 Loan Funder LLC v. 236 West One Enterprises Inc. Et Al
651895/23 Lovell Safety Mgt. Co., L.L.C. v. L.C. Const. & Sons, Inc.
805301/18 Maressa v. Scholz
152875/21 Martin-Hernao v. Katerra
651323/25 Marina Dist. Dev., Co., LLC T/a Borgata v. Kwak
156726/24 Marks v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group LLC Et Al
655688/24 Marriott Int'l, Inc. v. Raga Entertainment
154836/22 Martinez v. Cdl (new York) L.L.C. Et Al
655615/23 Metro. Partners Group Admin. v. Blue Apron Hldgs., Inc.
650446/25 Mir Hanson Associates v. Urban Life Inc. Et Al
652161/25 Mount Sinai Hosps. Group, Inc. v. Affinity Health Plan, Inc. Et Al
650760/25 Nittolo v. Rosenberg
156028/19 NYCTL 2018-A Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon As Collateral Agent And Custodian v. McCall
157666/22 NYCTL 2021-A Trust v. Wa Idf LLC Et Al
159124/190'Brien v. One Penn Plaza LLC
159205/24 Oliver v. NYC Police Dept.
654781/24 Optima Partners Hldgs. v. Sqn Capital Mgt.
650227/25 Oxford Porperty Group v. Digiglio
162439/14 Perez v. Church of The Incarnation
153810/25 Period Law Et Al v. NYC Dept. of Education
153751/21 Plaza Const. LLC v. Ware Industries, Inc. D/b/a
656327/17 Poke King Corner, Inc. v. 578 Ninth Ave. Associates
159209/19 Portoreal v. NYCH&HC And
152692/21 Ramirez v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
158043/24 Read v. B'way. Storage
162317/19 Rizwan v. Nuwest Logistics LLC
154832/22 Romero v. Zohdy-Osman
155262/22 Rose v. 1520-26 St. Nicholas Hldg. LLC Et Al
151700/22 Ross v. No Parking Today, Inc. Et Al
155405/25 Rrb
Unternehmungsberatung v. Zhang
652198/24 Securityscorecard, Inc. v. Cyber Drp Inc.
652129/25 Seward & Kissel Llp v. Druker
152835/25 Shwe v. Tisch

850212/25 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. Bowery At Spring Partners
850038/25 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. Pleasant St Bridgewater LLC Et Al
850476/24 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. Uws 83 Hldgs. LLC Et Al
154721/24 Siqueira v. Rcpil Landmark Properties
650834/25 Solutions 4 Community Health v. Upstate Family Health Center, Inc.
153881/24 Song v. Santiago
451646/24 State of NY v. Gonzalez
451604/24 State of NY v. Mikkelsen
161173/20 Stephan v. Turner Const. Co.
652416/23 Strategic Funding Source, Inc. v. Riccardo Jr
451972/24 NYC v. Windermere Properties LLC Et Al
150782/25 Tiron LLC v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings Et Al
159688/22 Travelers Indemnity Co. of Connecticut A/s/o Joanna Mastroliaanni D/b/a Elena Laderos v. Black Architects Llp Et Al
651408/25 Trc Master Fund LLC v. Sst Corp.
150536/20 Trustees of Columbia v. Rael Automatic Sprinkler
850406/24 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. 240 Park Ave. South Owner Lp
850430/24 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. Maasai Cairo on Madison LLC Et Al
810144/12 U.S. Bank v. Kim
156994/20 Urena v. Danny's Furniture Inc. Et Al
156667/25 Veksler v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal
850121/19 Velocity Commercial Capital v. Kaplan
160574/21 Walker St. LLC v. Prop. Creative LLC Et Al
154830/24 Warnasch v. Real Hosp. Ity Group
651268/25 Weinberg v. McG Equity Partners LLC Et Al
654094/23 Wheels Up Partners v. Exclusive Jets
850079/25 Wilmington Trust v. 90 Fifth Owner

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25

650802/

159690/24 Dumigan v. L'oreal USA, Inc. Et Al
154220/22 Duran v. Boston Properties, Inc. Et Al
653516/22 Edras Group Corp. v. Hudson Excess Ins. Co.
653982/23 Edward Tyler Nahem Fine Art v. Lee
850038/21 Elliot v. 463 W. 144th St. LLC
650949/25 Espinoza v. Pinecrest Group Corp. Et Al
651157/25 Eyzenberg & Co. v. Trilar Hldgs. LLC
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
157365/22 Fama v. The American Museum of Natural History Et Al
450854/25 Fields v. Niblack
654677/24 Flexport Int'l v. Eastern Jungle Gym, Inc.
156535/25 Forster v. NYC Et Al
160094/21 Freeland v. Chemtob
652961/25 Frio Energy Partners v. Finance Tech. Leverage
159683/24 George v. L'oreal USA, Inc. Et Al
151407/23 Gobelek v. Sakardin
155638/25 Great West Casualty Co. v. Allstate Ins. Co.
152248/25 Guerra v. R&R Universal Solutions
160726/24 Gutierrez Orellana v. Slab Builders
155188/19 Hairston v. Aracena
160113/16 Heard v. McGovern & Co.
161416/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Abreu-Rodriguez
151826/25 Hidalgo v. Rahman
652334/24 Hillidun Corp. v. Styleline Studios
158584/23 Histon v. Nirschel
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall
805054/25 Hutchenson Radlein v. Saland
150943/25 In The Matter of The Application of Hp Promenade Housing Dev. Fund Co. Inc. v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal
155960/25 In The Matter of The Application of Juan Niola v. NYC Et Al
156047/25 In The Matter of The Application of Sean Hirschhorn v. NYC Et Al
158446/19 Intersyfo v. Smith
151764/23 Jackson v. 111 Wall Fee Hldgs. LLC
151665/24 Jagessar v. Well Done Rlty. LLC Et Al
155107/16 Jara v. Durst Dev.
161615/23 Jose v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al
650182/25 Joyful Living Co., Ltd v. USA Homestart, Inc. Et Al
659255/24 Jpmorgan Chase & Co. Et Al v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co. Et Al
650525/25 L&E Brokerage v. Kassim
155284/24 L.H. v. Dave & Busters of New York, Inc. Et Al
654395/20 Lee v. Zeitlin
190253/14 Logudice v. American Talc Co.
153980/21 Lyles v. 465 West B'way. Co.-Op., Inc.
156622/24 Maria Dolores Chuqui As The Administrator Ad Prosequendum of The Estate of Jose Florencio Rodriguez Cajamarca v. Bfab LLC
155361/22 Marizatz v. Aves. NY LLC
150774/25 Matter of The Dearie Law Firm v. NYCH&HC Hosps. Corp.
651422/21 Medallion Financial Corp. Et Al v. Ede Service Corp. Et Al
154428/24 Mercedes-Benz Financial Services USA LLC v. Wheelchair Transportation Service Inc Et Al
659841/24 Mitchell Consultants NY Corp. v. 77 Rlty. Owner LLC
656158/21 Murphy v. Phg Funding LLC Et Al
650978/24 NYU Langone Hosps. v. Friendly Home Care, Inc. Et Al
650352/25 Out There Ooh S.R.L., Also D/b/a Out There, Inc. v. Bally Americas Inc.
653555/25 Pankowski v. Diefenbach
652666/25 Pennsylvania Dept. of Revenue v. Viking Dpp Exch. Ptners LLC
652595/25 Pennsylvania Dept. of Revenue v. CIL LLC
157299/24 Pettit v. NYCHA Et Al
651508/25 Powerflex Solar Hldgs. v. Distributed Solar Projects
653074/25 Precision Testing Laboratories Inc. v. Shane
652078/24 Rainero Molinari v. Rainero
156082/22 Rice v. Jt Magen & Co. Inc Et Al
151895/24 Rivera v. 104 Delancey St. Sm
157656/24 Rodriguez v. Orsird Rlty. Corp. Et Al
150623/23 Romanos v. Cabrini Blackfont LLC Et Al
100057/25 Ruiz-Petit v. Airbnb, Inc.
652484/25 Ryder Truck Rental v. Petro-Maspeht
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
153631/23 Sacks v. Rentacrate Enterprises
650212/24 Safety And Quality Plus, Inc. v. Battery Associates LLC Et Al
155655/18 Salvesen v. Port Auth. of New
154002/21 Samuel v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
156801/20 Scheimberg v. Lahey Service Corp.
150744/25 Schlachet v. Amc Entertainment Hlgs. Inc. Et Al
160095/18 Schnur v. Balestriere
156288/25 Shahr v. NYC
162246/23 Sharif v. East Side Auto Inc. Et Al
850419/24 Sig Crez 2023 Venture LLC v. Ref 46 St. LLC Et Al
152542/23 Smith v. 2 St Marks Pl. Hotel Corp. Et Al
162497/23 Sofi Bank v. Hooks
655848/24 South Ocean Aviation v. Pegasus Elite Aviation, Inc.
155312/22 St.-Louis v. Harbeck
160618/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Harris
157834/24 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Marte
652833/25 Streamvision Media LLC v. Lemma Media, Inc.
850579/23 The Bank of NY Mellon Trust Co. v. Lowe
156536/25 The Board of Mgrs. of The Langston Condominium v. Miles
161724/24 The Board of Mgrs. of The Riverwalk Court Condominium Suing on Behalf of Unit Owners v. Latifi
451696/24 NYC Et Al v. Board of Mgrs. of The 1051 59th St. Condominium Et Al
654673/21 The Hedaya Capital Group, Inc. v. Park Falls Industrial Mgt. LLC Et Al
651566/25 Tillis v. Zar Rlty. NY LLC Et Al
159581/23 Torres Pangol v. Kiamie Industries Inc. Et Al
159869/24 Torres v. Counter Culture Coffee, Inc.
159831/23 Toure v. Campbell
150354/24 Troia v. Loanst., Inc. Et Al
158860/23 Trustees of NYC Dist. Council of Carpenters Pension Fund v. S&N Builders, Inc. Et Al
850554/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Torzi
157081/24 Unitrain Safeguard Ins. Co. v. Fernin
652063/25 Uplifting Tech. Inc. Et Al v. Yu
156994/20 Urena v. Danny's Furniture Inc. Et Al
155898/21 Vargas v. 265 East 7th St. Corp.
805103/19 Waheed v. Kim
652311/25 Walker-212w18th LLC v. Best 1 LLC Et Al
654094/23 Wheels Up Partners v. Exclusive Jets

651597/25 Yang v. Apt. Improvement Corp. Et Al
160175/24 Zapata v. Board of Education of The City School Dist. of NYC Et Al
160321/23 Zumba-Yunga v. Liebhaber Co. Inc. Et Al
THURSDAY, JUNE 26
160635/21 176-178 Lexington Ave. LLC v. Seneca Ins. Co., Inc.
161119/20 220 5th Rlty. LLC v. Ram Dev., Inc.
850142/25 527 West Partners LLC v. Our Children's Foundation, Inc. Et Al
656522/23 5w Public Relations LLC v. V Wholesalers LLC
652167/25 809 Madison Owner v. Carlton Associates, Inc.
151920/22 93rd Bldg. Corp. v. Hefti
652644/25 Afc Agent LLC v. Jg Hldco LLC
157236/19 Anderes v. Ford Foundation
158526/22 Arias v. 2400 Amsterdam Ave. Rlty. Corp. Et Al
155764/20 Asmal v. NY Historical Society
160038/20 Avella v. Sweeney & Conroy
154212/22 Badstein v. 9 Dekalb Owner LLC Et Al
157421/22 Barrera Garcia v. Terminal Fee Owner Lp Et Al
190102/25 Battista v. 3m Co. Et Al
652524/24 Bb Energy USA LLC v. Keyera Energy Inc.
162203/19 Bhatia v. NYCTA
652757/24 Bkms Mgt. LLC v. Abbsbn LLC Et Al
159751/24 Board of Mgrs. of The 48-54 West 138th St. Condominium v. Burdock
155707/22 Borja v. NYC Et Al
161079/24 Brito v. Priestner
160988/18 Burger v. Food Emporium Inc.
805077/25 Burshteyn v. Afaneh M.D.
152397/23 Cajamarca Ramon v. Pizzarotti
155169/25 Cale v. Mount Sinai Business Health Et Al
150869/23 Cantos Chilinguina v. Galicia Contracting And Restoration Corp. Et Al
150088/22 Carlisi v. Plaza Const. LLC Et Al
652127/22 Cfs Enterprises Inc. T/a Cfs Steel Co. v. Jemzn Const. Inc. Et Al
157172/25 Churchill v. Financial Indus. Regulatory Auth., Inc. (fnra)
850158/23 Citibank v. Pieper
4307076/21 Comm'r. of State Ins. Fund v. Sovereign Industries Group Inc
652516/25 Concord Music Group, Inc. v. Triller Hold Co LLC Et Al
151645/24 Connex One Inc. v. USA Vape Co. Inc.
160746/24 Cordero v. Zara USA
156654/22 Cruz Pataky v. 1199 Housing Corp. Et Al
152296/25 D. Boral Capital LLC v. Current Group Inc.
152000/25 Davidoff Hutcher & Citron Lp v. Attal
154344/25 Demunn v. NYC Et Al
654504/25 Edeg Pedicab, Inc. v. 109 West 38th LLC Et Al
153445/18 Feydys v. NYCTA
850032/22 Flushing Bank v. Cory Rlty., Inc. Et Al
653020/24 Fox And Main v. Pyramid-Bmc Hldgs.
150164/22 Friedman v. Shanks
156419/20 Gabriele v. Boyarsky
155022/25 Georgiades v. Reader
651559/25 Gramercy North Associates LLC v. 50 Lexington Smoke And Variety Store Corp. Aka 50 Lexington Variety Store Corp. Et Al
657563/19 Greenwich Advisory & Co. v. Kranos Corp.
151487/22 Gregory Berg v. NYC
652820/25 Grossman v. Zahler
152568/25 Guzel v. Combs
850537/24 Holloway v. Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center Et Al
155406/18 Huber v. Wiener
650740/24 In The Matter of The Application of On The Move Hldgs. v. James
158791/23 James v. NYC Et Al
161176/17 Jekielek v. 260 Partners
161782/23 Jewish Home Lifecare v. Shannon
153965/22 Johnson v. NYC Et Al
154666/25 Kepley v. Loeb Jr
160647/24 Kogan v. Sotamba-Saldana
154893/19 Kosovsky v. Kosovsky
160183/21 Kraemer v. Montefiore Health System, Inc. Et Al
161835/24 Kremer v. Bps Us Inc. Et Al
159336/23 Kwarta v. Delta Rly. Lines, Inc. Et Al
154310/24 Lex54bh LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank
451951/25 Louis v. NYC Et Al
150910/20 Markisic v. Nordstrom, Inc.
655863/23 Meir Electric D/b/a Meir Electric Co. v. El-Kam Rlty. Co. Et Al
155328/22 Mercedes v. Turner Const. Co. Et Al
153376/18 Merchant v. NYC
651028/22 Mic General Ins. Corp. v. Eckart
651578/25 Mixx Graphics Inc. D/b/a The Mixx v. Higher Breed Nj LLC
159249/24 Montilla v. NYC Et Al
159241/21 Morrillo v. 700 W. 180th St. Associates Inc.
450661/24 Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corp. v. Mercedes
155224/25 Moya v. NYC Et Al
161144/24 Mullen v. Vargas
451839/25 NYCTA v. Transport Workers Union of America
652198/25 Newbank v. 1519 Wall St Inc Et Al
158531/21 Nicholson v. NYC Et Al
157568/20 NYCTL 2019-A Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon v. 611 East 6th St. LLC Et Al
151693/20 Palacio v. Cosmic Rlty. Partners LLC
156956/23 Parajon v. Monadnock Dev.
156463/22 Paugh v. 153 Jamaica Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
451983/25 People of The State of NY v. Devlock LLC
653015/25 Perroni v. Unifor Inc Dba Molteni&C Dada Molteni Group Et Al
155868/23 Pina Munoz v. Ch 150 Hldgs.
151504/22 Pulver v. Starbucks Corp. D/b/a Starbucks Coffee Co.
157347/23 Queiroz Cantisano v. Westmore Owners Corp. Et Al
451353/20 Ramos v. NYC
150123/24 Rance v. L'oreal USA, Inc. Et Al
153859/20 Redzepagic v. NYC Et Al
152112/22 Reyes v. J.T. Magen & Co., Inc. Et Al
155157/25 Robinson v. NYC Et Al
152911/25 Royal York Associates v. Fipro
150968/25 Ruales v. 19-21 Greene St. Condominium Et Al
158193/23 Sier v. Skyline Restoration Inc.
805345/17 Silberman v. Del Pizzo
654061/22 Sing For Service v. Allianz U.S., Inc., A California Corp. Et Al
155216/21 Smalls v. NYCTA Et Al
651524/18 Snyder v. Jp Morgan Securities
650642/23 South32 Chile Copper Hldgs. Pty Ltd (formerly Blue Murray Pty Ltd) v. Sumitomo Metal Mining Co., Ltd. Et Al
151388/24 Spitalny v. 49 West 37th St. LLC Et Al
655753/24 Spivakov v. Lucy Gambarian As The Ltd. Administrator of The Estate of Armen Gambarian

Court Calendars

COURT NOTES

Continued from page 9

out charge to an employee's leave credits may be allowed to attend conferences of recognized professional organizations. Such conferences must be directly related to the employee's profession [of] or professional duties. This leave is subject to the prior approval of the administrative authority and to the staffing needs of the court or agency.

(n) The Chief Administrator of the Courts or [his or his] their designee may grant leaves with pay for reasons not itemized in this Part.

PART 25. CAREER SERVICE

Section 25.18. Establishment of a Continuing Eligible List

The Chief Administrator of the Courts may establish a continuing eligible list for any class of positions for which [inadequate numbers of qualified persons are found available for recruitment or appointment] such lists are appropriate. The Chief Administrator may only establish continuing eligible lists for any class of positions filled through open competitive examination. Names of eligibles shall be inserted in such list from time to time as applicants are tested and found qualified in examinations held at such intervals as may be prescribed by the Chief Administrator. Such successive examinations shall, so far as practicable, be constructed and rated so as to be equivalent tests of the merit and fitness of candidates. The name of any candidate who passes any such examination and who is otherwise qualified shall be placed on the continuing eligible list in the rank corresponding to his or her final rating on such examination. The period of eligibility of successful candidates for certification and appointment from such continuing eligible list, as a result of any such examination, shall be fixed by the Chief Administra-

652089/25 S&C Technologies, Inc. v. Dirwa
154359/25 St.Clement v. Fuchs
158218/20 Stango v. Silverstein Properties
158495/22 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. 167 Rx, Inc. Et Al
150850/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. Et Al v. Comprehensive Diagnostics And Imaging
160002/23 Steadfast Ins. Co. A/s/o Pizzarotti v. Prestige Restoration Corp. Et Al
655955/20 Strategic Funding Source, Inc. v. Wulvbreber
159889/23 Strum v. Lasry
156863/25 Sydney Sol Group Ltd. v. NYC Loft Board Et Al
152840/25 T-C 2 Herald Square Owner LLC v. Herald Square Owner LLC Et Al
151780/24 Tavera v. Delaney Associates
653012/19 Taxi Tours Inc. v. Go NY Tours, Inc.
150829/23 Tschourinsky v. Castaneda
190049/22 Talgoirsky v. Blackmer Et Al
653093/25 United Farm Family Co. v. Lee Zain
161386/20 Vasquez v. NYC Et Al
651224/25 Veolia Water North America-Northeast v. Sebastian Capital, Inc. Et Al
152550/24 Waheed v. Storage Mart LLC Et Al
151554/24 Watt v. Bp Prods. North America Inc. Et Al
654086/23 Webster v. Ferguson
850100/22 Wells Fargo Bank v. Lafayette 199
652783/24 Wesco Ins. Co. v. Range Builders LLC Et Al
161762/17 Williams v. NYCTA
651138/24 Xu v. Lu
156550/24 Zou v. Olavarria
160398/22 Zumba Malan v. Petretti & Associates LLC Et Al

E-Filing Submission Part

Adjourned for Working Copies Part

Part 1

Justice Adam Silvera
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3722
Room 300

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

656157/23 Hartford Fire Ins. Co. A/s/o Carole Kent And Conrad Kent v. Gurril Inc Et Al

Part 2

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

654845/21 211 Seventh Avenue v. Hana Sushi, Inc. Et Al
160560/22 Barros v. Bokonos 243
150652/24 Colt Administrator v. One West Bank F.S.B. Et Al
655125/17 Contegiacomo And Associates v. Lecoq
155984/21 Dan v. Verschleiser
155528/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
155714/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
652962/22 Frydo Capital Group v. Park Rio East
651710/23 Keller Augusta v. Maxben Group
653599/20 Lotus Residences LLC. Et Al v. Northfield Ins. Co. Et Al
651170/23 Metro. Baptist Church v. Wesco Ins. Co.
162439/14 Perez v. Church of The Incarnation
656327/17 Poke King Corner, Inc. v. 578 Ninth Ave. Associates
653353/22 Porter v. Wilson
655860/20 Zar Ventures LLC v. Blue Sky Equities L.L.C.

654845/21 211 Seventh Avenue v. Hana Sushi, Inc. Et Al
160560/22 Barros v. Bokonos 243
150652/24 Colt Administrator v. One West Bank F.S.B. Et Al
655125/17 Contegiacomo And Associates v. Lecoq
155984/21 Dan v. Verschleiser
155528/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
155714/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
652962/22 Frydo Capital Group v. Park Rio East
651710/23 Keller Augusta v. Maxben Group
653599/20 Lotus Residences LLC. Et Al v. Northfield Ins. Co. Et Al
651170/23 Metro. Baptist Church v. Wesco Ins. Co.
162439/14 Perez v. Church of The Incarnation
656327/17 Poke King Corner, Inc. v. 578 Ninth Ave. Associates
653353/22 Porter v. Wilson
655860/20 Zar Ventures LLC v. Blue Sky Equities L.L.C.

656327/17 17 Poke King Corner, Inc. v. 578 Ninth Ave. Associates
653353/22 Porter v. Wilson
655860/20 Zar Ventures LLC v. Blue Sky Equities L.L.C.

261523/22 2030 Embassy LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
265704/20 245 West 104th St. Housing Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
252246/16 2670 West 19th St. v. Tax Comm. of The
258583/21 278 Eighth Associates v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256250/14 315 East 62 LLC v. Tax Comm. of The
261560/17 385 First Ave. Condominium v. Tax Comm. of The
261405/22 591 Rlty. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
262895/15 905 West End Ave. v. Tax Comm. of The
264210/16 91 Payson Owners Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
26501718 Atlantic 30 Wall Tenant LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263522/18 Benyetta 148 v. Tax Comm. of The
652127/22 Cfs Enterprises Inc. T/a Cfs Steel Co. v. Jemzn Const. Inc. Et Al
255922/15 De Maimon Corp. v. The Tax Comm.
159348/20 Ellison Systems, Inc. Et Al v. Shine & Co. Up Et Al
261166/22 Esther Mgt. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
264842/16 Glass Farmhouse Condominium v. Tax Comm. of The
258556/21 Hpg 29 2nd Ave LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261300/22 21 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256721/13 Kition Bldg. Corporatio v. The Tax Comm.
263719/18 Macarthur Properties I LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
240061/23 Madfern LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
263831/21 Madison 45 Broad Dev. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
655863/23 Meir Electric D/b/a Meir Electric Co. v. El-Kam Rlty. Co. Et Al
257164/19 Midtown Stage Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256593/16 Milton Boron v. The Tax Comm.
262063/13 NYC Dist.Council of Carpenters v. The Tax Comm.
650815/22 Petrolawicz v. Ando Rlty. LLC
264924/17 Rtr Funding Group, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
262749/15 Sedona Condominium v. Tax Comm. of The
264186/16 The Carlton Registry Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
264326/20 The Shubert Organization, Inc. (lon-gacre) v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256868/21 Village East Commercial LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261962/19 W149 Rlty. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
252307/16 West 73rd Tenants Corp. v. Tax Comm. of The
262900/12 Westerly Condominium v. The Tax Comm.

654845/21 211 Seventh Avenue v. Hana Sushi, Inc. Et Al
160560/22 Barros v. Bokonos 243
150652/24 Colt Administrator v. One West Bank F.S.B. Et Al
655125/17 Contegiacomo And Associates v. Lecoq
155984/21 Dan v. Verschleiser
155528/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
155714/20 E.Z.Lor Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Narkis
652962/22 Frydo Capital Group v. Park Rio East
651710/23 Keller Augusta v. Maxben Group
653599/20 Lotus Residences LLC. Et Al v. Northfield Ins. Co. Et Al
651170/23 Metro. Baptist Church v. Wesco Ins. Co.
162439/14 Perez v. Church of The Incarnation
656327/17 Poke King Corner, Inc. v. 578 Ninth Ave. Associates
653353/22 Porter v. Wilson
655860/20 Zar Ventures LLC v. Blue Sky Equities L.L.C.

655821/24 Rcm-Emg Library Hldgs. v. Raven Capital Mgt.
153621/18 Robert M. Gans v. Wilbee Corp.
655149/23 Roseann Serpico As Executrix of The Estate of Gaetano Serpico Et Al v. 525 8th LLC Et Al
651268/25 Weinberg v. McG Equity Partners LLC Et Al

653020/24 Ajh NY Rlty. LLC Et Al v. Broker Success LLC Et Al
655821/24 Rcm-Emg Library Hldgs. v. Raven Capital Mgt.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
652355/23 508 Operations v. Artistic Holiday Designs
651801/24 Arena Special Opportunities Partners I v. Alfonsi

652355/23 508 Operations v. Artistic Holiday Designs
651801/24 Arena Special Opportunities Partners I v. Alfonsi

Part 6

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

805414/21 Falk v. Resnick M.D.
805331/22 Hickman Brown v. Ellis M.D.
805305/17 Lin v. Chan
805301/18 Maerska v. Scholz
805033/21 Nielsen v. Goldstein
805112/18 Reilly v. Adusumilli
805198/22 White v. Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
805103/19 Waheed v. Kim

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
805062/24 A.S. v. NYC NYCH&HC Corp.
805225/17 Baker v. NY Orthopedic
805293/20 Baker v. Lenox Hill Radiology And Medical Imaging Associates
805033/18 Bent v. Bluepearl NY
805281/22 Blackwell v. NY Sports And Joins Orthopaedic Specialists Et Al
805392/22 Brown-Simmons v. Crooms M.D.
805077/25 Burshteyn v. Afaneh M.D.
805331/23 Castillo v. Kopinsky
805248/23 Cervoni v. Advanced Fertility Services
805384/19 Col v. Scott
805030/21 Conti Battaglia v. Bigelow M.D.
805365/22 Degroff v. Bostrom Md
805253/23 Deva v. Chelnis M.D.
805375/22 Dillon v. Rodeo M.D.
805090/22 Doe v. Mount Sinai West Et Al
805105/23 Eckland v. Horn Md
805355/21 Epstein v. Calat D.M.D.
805331/18 Filacchione v. Marwin
805039/21 Gati v. Banik
805367/23 Gilliard v. Kinsella M.D.
805281/22 Glover v. Delacure M.D.
805074/22 Gross v. Mount Sinai South Nassau Et Al
805332/23 Hatziantoniou v. Lenox Hill Hosp. Et Al
805037/24 Holloway v. Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center Et Al
805005/21 J. P. v. Heaton
155476/17 Jaffe v. NY Presbyterian
805436/23 Kleinstein v. Driza
805194/22 Kushnick v. Felderman M.D.
805251/24 Lee Sam v. Boettner M.D
805016/24 Levy v. Biviano
805095/24 N. v. Miller Md
805029/24 Nechama Muehnik v. Nisha Garga
805040/24 Noce v. Mandigo Md
805199/24 O'Connor v. Priestner M.D.
805080/20 O'Kieki v. Joyce Gerdisk-Karp
805408/22 Ohanian Md v. Johnson Md
805140/24 Oldak v. Dewitt Rehabilitation And Nursing Center. Inc. Dba Upper East Side Rehabilitation And Nursing Center
805283/17 S. v. Migotsky
805117/20 Salas v. Mount Sinai West
805115/23 Shore v. Low D.M.D.
805392/23 Tancredi v. Sottile & Megna
805032/22 Torbati v. Bauer Dmd
805018/24 Valdes v. Jewish Home Lifecare
805016/21 Vasilakopoulos v. Proudft M.D.
805245/22 Vaughn v. Owen D.O.
805019/23 Vazquez v. Mount Sinai Hosp. Et Al
805324/24 Way v. Lemer M.D.
452112/20 Webber v. Mt. Sinai Beth Israel

Part 9

Justice Linda M. Capitti
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3848
Room 355

Part 11

Justice Lyle E. Frank
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3314
Room 412

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

651775/24 120 Main Hotel LLC v. Sompno America Ins. Co.
160052/24 451 West 46th St. Rlty. LLC v. Rutilio Palacios
655112/19 535-545 Fee v. Judlaur Contracting, Inc. Et Al
653762/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Raymond Morel Et Al
157193/25 Ben David Yosef v. Huang
651509/25 Benevolent And Protective Order of Elks of The U.S. of America v. Swiss Re Corporate Solutions Elite Ins. Corp.
153289/19 Board of Mgrs. of The v. 141 East 88th St.
153739/18 C. v. NYC
451318/20 NYC v. 114 West 86th St. Rlty.
656229/23 Clarke Contracting LLC v. Promethean Builders LLC Et Al
155949/24 Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. v. Gotham Organization, Inc. Et Al
155510/24 Curbelo v. Go Covenant LLC Et Al
100005/25 Davis v. Lidl
161201/24 Employers Ins. Co. of Wausau As Subrogee of 555 Tenth Ave. Leasehold Condominium v. Monadnock Const., Inc. Et Al
655905/20 Escrown LLC v. Arepas NY Corp.
650871/23 Essential Home Remodeling, Inc., Individually, And on Behalf of All Other Similarly Situated NY Lien Law Article 3-A Trust Beneficiaries v. Rossin
653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
150806/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Pension Fund Et Al

651775/24 120 Main Hotel LLC v. Sompno America Ins. Co.
160052/24 451 West 46th St. Rlty. LLC v. Rutilio Palacios
655112/19 535-545 Fee v. Judlaur Contracting, Inc. Et Al
653762/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Raymond Morel Et Al
157193/25 Ben David Yosef v. Huang
651509/25 Benevolent And Protective Order of Elks of The U.S. of America v. Swiss Re Corporate Solutions Elite Ins. Corp.
153289/19 Board of Mgrs. of The v. 141 East 88th St.
153739/18 C. v. NYC
451318/20 NYC v. 114 West 86th St. Rlty.
656229/23 Clarke Contracting LLC v. Promethean Builders LLC Et Al
155949/24 Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. v. Gotham Organization, Inc. Et Al
155510/24 Curbelo v. Go Covenant LLC Et Al
100005/25 Davis v. Lidl
161201/24 Employers Ins. Co. of Wausau As Subrogee of 555 Tenth Ave. Leasehold Condominium v. Monadnock Const., Inc. Et Al
655905/20 Escrown LLC v. Arepas NY Corp.
650871/23 Essential Home Remodeling, Inc., Individually, And on Behalf of All Other Similarly Situated NY Lien Law Article 3-A Trust Beneficiaries v. Rossin
653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
150806/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Pension Fund Et Al

651775/24 120 Main Hotel LLC v. Sompno America Ins. Co.
160052/24 451 West 46th St. Rlty. LLC v. Rutilio Palacios
655112/19 535-545 Fee v. Judlaur Contracting, Inc. Et Al
653762/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Raymond Morel Et Al
157193/25 Ben David Yosef v. Huang
651509/25 Benevolent And Protective Order of Elks of The U.S. of America v. Swiss Re Corporate Solutions Elite Ins. Corp.
153289/19 Board of Mgrs. of The v. 141 East 88th St.
153739/18 C. v. NYC
451318/20 NYC v. 114 West 86th St. Rlty.
656229/23 Clarke Contracting LLC v. Promethean Builders LLC Et Al
155949/24 Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. v. Gotham Organization, Inc. Et Al
155510/24 Curbelo v. Go Covenant LLC Et Al
100005/25 Davis v. Lidl
161201/24 Employers Ins. Co. of Wausau As Subrogee of 555 Tenth Ave. Leasehold Condominium v. Monadnock Const., Inc. Et Al
655905/20 Escrown LLC v. Arepas NY Corp.
650871/23 Essential Home Remodeling, Inc., Individually, And on Behalf of All Other Similarly Situated NY Lien Law Article 3-A Trust Beneficiaries v. Rossin
653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
150806/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Pension Fund Et Al

655761/21 Bank of America v. Calbox
154156/24 Bernal Parra v. 99 John Deco Lofts Condominium
651349/25 Bernstein v. Kia America, Inc. Et Al
161233/23 Daquilema v. Efin Mgt. Corp. Et Al
659290/24 Elkins v. Williams Pt P.C. Et Al
652818/24 Lola Prod.in, Inc. v. Biribilis
650225/22 Nat. General Ins. Co. v. Bokow
158043/24 Read v. B'way. Storage
451646/24 State of NY v. Gonzalez
154519/25 The Board of Mgrs. of The Barbizon/63 Condominium v. Lo Casio

655761/21 Bank of America v. Calbox
154156/24 Bernal Parra v. 99 John Deco Lofts Condominium
651349/25 Bernstein v. Kia America, Inc. Et Al
161233/23 Daquilema v. Efin Mgt. Corp. Et Al
659290/24 Elkins v. Williams Pt P.C. Et Al
652818/24 Lola Prod.in, Inc. v. Biribilis
650225/22 Nat. General Ins. Co. v. Bokow

154519/25 The Board of Mgrs. of The Barbizon/63 Condominium v. Lo Casio

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
653507/25 American Transit Insurance Company v. Athena Chiropractic Pc
65344/24 Bond Immoibilien Lp v. in The Know Hldg. Co.
158691/22 Day v. The Plumber's Shop & Associates LLC Et Al
653516/22 Edras Group Corp. v. Hudson Excess Ins. Co.
160020/24 Harrell v. Fort Tyron Rehabilitation And Health Care Facility
161416/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Abreu-Rodriguez
1603

Part 27
Justice Denise M Dominguez
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5625
Courtroom 289

Part 39
Justice James G. Clynes
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3619
Room 307

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
157531/24 Access Group Loan Reserve Trust 1 v. Kim
152675/21 Marin-Hernao v. Kattera
654781/24 Optima Partners Hldgs. v. Sqn Capital Mgt.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al
152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods.
North America Inc Et Al
152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC
158265/19 Burk v. Camirand
153525/20 Cna Ins. Co. v. 225 Fourth LLC
154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al
158485/21 Dellamedaglia v. Rite-Way Demolition Inc Et Al
154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors
654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Iqbal Physician PC
160113/16 Heard v. McGovern & Co. LLC
651865/24 Kastenbaum v. Kelly
153980/21 Lyles v. 465 West B'way. Co.-Op., Inc.
160060/23 Martinez v. Mgm Yonkers, Inc.
650978/24 NYU Langone Hosps. v. Friendly Home Care, Inc. Et Al
153680/20 Osario v. NYC
650352/25 Out There Ooh S.R.L., Also D/b/a Out There, Inc. v. Bally Americas Inc
61287/21 Parano v. NYC Et Al
157655/21 Polishchuk v. Starbucks Coffee Corporation Et Al
157042/20 Rodriguez v. Astoria on Stage
150946/21 Rodriguez v. Jewish Home Lifecare
159943/20 Romero v. Ry Mgt., Co., Inc.
157808/24 Rosario v. Bbl 1-65-2 LLC Et Al
155691/14 Schwartz v. Board of Mgrs. of 260
100950/21 Sedgwick v. St Barnabas Hosp.
150074/22 Squatrito v. Tishman Speyer Properties Inc. Et Al
159211/24 Squiszatto v. Edition Mgt. LLC D/b/a NY Edition Hotel Et Al
153479/24 Standard Rlty. Associates Et Al v. Cupo
152497/22 Suarez v. Manhattan Chelsea Market LLC Et Al
161254/20 Teresa Rivera v. United Jewish Council of The East Side
161724/24 The Board of Mgrs. of The Riverwalk Court Condominium Suing on Behalf of Unit Owners v. Latifi
152754/22 Tineo v. 144 St LLC Et Al
154960/21 Vasquez v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al
151331/19 Watson v. Terence Cardinal Cooke
151540/21 Wint v. G&G Deli Grocery Inc
154700/24 Youngkin v. Jpmorgan Chase Bank

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
656522/23 5w Public Relations LLC v. V Wholesalers LLC
652047/25 79th St. Corp. v. 440 East 79th St. Owners Corp.
159714/18 Berkowitz v. NYC
150894/19 Bryan v. Boro Park Center For
160988/18 Burger v. Food Emporium Inc.
150814/19 Calle Narvaez v. 1165 B'way. Corp.
152396/24 Castillo Rodriguez v. Silverstein 120 B'way. LLC Et Al
158447/20 Doherty v. Memorial Sloan-Kettering
159073/21 Estate of Ingo Greizinger By Yvonne M. Murphy v. Maloney Esq.
162269/19 Hoppie v. 34 Downing Owners Corp.
156083/25 In The Matter of The Application of Sacco & Fillas v. Law Offices of Andrew Park
160183/21 Kraemer v. Montefiore Health System, Inc. Et Al
161835/24 Kremer v. Bps Us Inc. Et Al
653916/24 Zur v. Cretella

Part 41
Justice Nicholas W. Moyné
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3984
Room 327

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
653641/18 Heykal Properties v. 450 West 31st St. Owners
151700/22 Ross v. No Parking Today, Inc. Et Al
451972/24 NYC v. Windermere Properties LLC Et Al
155957/23 Torres v. NY Univ. Et Al

Motion
155957/23 Torres v. NY Univ. Et Al

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

Motion
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
654685/2231-61 Vernon Blvd LLC v. S.W.G. Services Corp. Et Al
652659/23 Arlus Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.
653514/18 Pizzarotti Ibc v. A.L. One Const., Inc.

Part 51
Matrimonial Part
Justice Lisa S. Headley
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3846
Room 122

Part 73R
Special Referee
Justice Diego Santiago
60 Centre Street
Room 354

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
312718/97 Alvarez v. Morochio
157520/17 Castro Gonzalez v. 60-74 Gansevoort St. LLC
151391/22 Holguin v. 75 First Ave. Club of NY LLC Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
650443/21 Schulman v. Schulman
151679/23 Burgos Espinal v. 188 St. Nick Associates
155949/23 Carduner v. Plymouth Mgt. Group, Inc. Et Al
160828/22 Chigiano-Chaluisa v. Brend Restoration LLC Et Al
152339/22 Chubb Nat. Ins. Co. A/s/o Mohammad Farrukh v. Marcelo Berenstein Et Al
160496/24 Cruz v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al
156814/25 Doe v. Zara USA, Inc. Et Al
156987/24 Galvan Castro v. Mount Sinai Hosp. Group, Inc. Et Al
152392/23 Gonzalez v. Elysium Const. Inc. Et Al
157919/23 Greene v. NYCHA
151335/23 Herrera v. Noir NY Et Al
157537/23 Inciarte Kincron v. 720 Wea Ventures
161615/23 Jose v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al
153231/23 Klemm v. One East River Pl. Rlty. Co. II
451994/24 L. v. NYC Et Al
153948/23 Margarita v. Aron Rlty. Hldgs., Inc. Et Al
158761/23 Modafferi v. Tiffany And Co. U.S. Sales
155574/23 Morales Mendoza v. Eo 160 Water LLC Et Al
153543/23 Mueller v. Target Corp. D/b/a Target Stores
152776/20 Pasquini v. T.D. Bank
157905/23 Polanco Benitez v. Forest Hills Owners Corp. Et Al
152481/23 Quispe Guerrero v. Graham Court Owners Corp.
159385/23 Ramirez Baez v. Rehab & Design Const. Corp. Et Al
157437/20 Rivera v. Quadrum 38
158656/23 Rodriguez v. Balas
152278/19 Romulus v. Lillian Goldman Family
159742/21 Rosario v. 34 Hillside Ave.
156418/19 Shared Equities Co., LLC v. Bolanos
156218/22 Simon v. St. James's Condominium Corp. Et Al
150615/19 Suarez v. Nat. Rlty. Systems Inc.
162169/24 Velez v. The Bridge, Inc.
151705/23 Wamputskir v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al
156559/24 Zeas v. Dkm Steel Const. Corp. Et Al

Part 84R
Special Referee
Justice Jeremy R. Feinberg
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3207
Room 641

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
656948/21 Ametek, Inc. Et Al v. Goldfarb
653994/23 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ulerio Evangelista

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
650682/24 White Oak Commercial Finance v. NY And Co Ecomm LLC Et Al

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
655430/23 Schultz v. Martinez
650081/23 Yarrow Two LLC v. Khatibi

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
653877/24 Mt Propco LLC v. Williams

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
190052/25 Blakely v. Aerco International
190177/25 Castellucci v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co. Et Al
190120/21 Cornicelli v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
190001/21 Frances McGowan v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
190253/14 Logiudice v. American Talc Co.
190099/14 Miller v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al

THURSDAY, JUNE 26
190102/25 Battista v. 3m Co. Et Al
190259/22 Curran v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
190049/22 Tsagouris v. Blackmer Et Al

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
9509903/21 A. v. NYC
161245/21 Arch Mortgage Assurance Co. v. Luna
153817/22 Brienza v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950409/21 Bruno v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950246/21 D. v. NYC
950012/20 John Doe v. Yeshiva Univ.
950253/20 M. v. Archdiocese of NY
451881/21 M. v. NYC Et Al
158851/22 Meehan v. Corporate Mezyyon
950102/20 Michaels v. NYC Et Al
950126/20 Mulqueen v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950868/21 Rojas v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950176/21 W. v. NYC

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950188/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950146/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950191/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950359/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950190/21 F. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a
950010/20 Finnegan v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950673/21 Gannon v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
153134/25 Hph Lenox LLC v. Fall 951386/21 Marzano v. The Archdiocese of NY Et Al
156909/25 Newman v. Duboise
950801/21 S. v. Rockefeller Univ. A/a/a

Motion
653141/25 Akf Inc. v. 3 Bridges Brewing, Inc. Et Al
950598/20 Alexander v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese
156696/25 Cameron Sky v. The Board of Mgrs. of The New Yorker Condominium
950683/21 Conklin v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950183/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of

156421/21 Utica First Ins. Co. As Subrogee of Jia Xing 39th Inc. v. Safety First Hood Cleaning Inc Et Al
157639/22 Villagomez v. Eo 160
Water LLC Et Al
152550/24 Waheed v. Storage Mart LLC Et Al
157738/23 Watson v. Mary Manning Walsh Nursing Home Co., Inc.
157150/19 Woods v. NY Univ.
153477/24 Xu v. Liu
151526/24 Zadok v. Lomner

Motion
156631/25 Baer v. Motorcar Classics
154242/25 Cohen v. Columbia Grammar And Preparatory School
153193/24 Goldman v. Icaro Media Group, Inc. Et Al
161993/24 In The Matter of The Application For An Order on Behalf of S.C. v. Geico General Ins. Co.
155763/21 Johnson v. 781 Metro. Ave Jv Llc
154266/25 Kopley v. Loeb Jr.
153472/20 Martinez v. Hudson Yards North Tower
152811/23 Rodriguez Meza v. Chuang Heng Rego Park
650968/25 Rolle v. Jp Morgan Chase Bank N.A.
154090/21 Sawyer v. 1120 Fifth Ave. Corp. Et Al

**Part 52
City Part**
Justice Carol Sharpe
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3742
Room 1045
TUESDAY, JUNE 24
160975/20 Benevento v. NYC
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
154671/23 Alvarez v. NYC
157736/22 Anil v. NYC Et Al
155981/18 Avesitian v. NYC
161228/15 Bennett v. NYC
154032/20 Blanc v. NYC
150567/23 Boyd Coggins v. Baymen Industries Ltd. Et Al
157038/23 Bradshaw v. NYC Et Al
154483/20 By Her Parent And Natural v. NYC
656773/21 Cannizzaro v. NYC Et Al
159468/19 Castillio v. NYC
157549/23 Cespedes v. NYC Et Al
161322/19 Cornel v. NYC
150011/18D Angelo v. NYC
154888/22 Dais v. Harlem Community Preservation Project
158800/20 Diallo v. NYC
154941/18 Edvarria v. NYC
157656/21 Echevares v. NYC Et Al
157085/18 Elsmas As Representative of v. Rojas
153940/16 Emby v. NYC
157997/21 Feiger v. NYC
153478/20 Fontanez v. NYC
153784/20 Frazier v. NYC Police
157941/21 Glenn v. NYC Et Al
155552/19 Glover v. Con Edison Et Al
153459/20 Gumbs v. NYC
158057/20 H v. NYC
161179/19 Hahner v. NYC
150785/19 Henry v. Rojas
153557/22 Hines v. NYC Et Al
150298/22 Hudson v. NYC Et Al
155844/21 Ins. Co. of Greater NY As Subrogee of The Leonard Condominium v. NYC
150305/22 Johnson v. NYC Et Al
151340/20 Joseph v. NYC
152898/22 Joyce v. NYC Et Al
151560/22 Kastrati v. NYC Et Al
452530/20 King v. NYC
100297/21 Lee v. NYC Human
155912/21 Legister v. NYC Et Al
450002/21 Lopez v. NYC
157501/18 Lugo v. NYC
159983/21 Malloy v. NYC
151204/17 McCray v. NYC
153746/20 Mohamed v. NYC
102877/11 Molina v. NYC
154367/23 Pennetti v. NYC Et Al
150003/20 Petrizio v. Touati
650260/18 Progressive Max Ins. v. Elsmas
151080/22 Richardson v. NYC
452308/23 Richardson v. Naites
155416/20 Ripans v. NYC
153675/21 Rodriguez v. NYC Et Al
159736/18 Rohan v. NYC
151621/23 Ross v. NYC Dept. of Education
152098/20 S. T. By His Mother And v. NYC
153105/22 Seetaram v. NYC
NYCH&HC Corp.
154918/24 Sellers v. NYC Et Al
450417/20 Shimson-Shagy v. NYC Et Al
157761/23 Simmons v. NYC Et Al
154591/19 Souffrant Valdes v. NYC Dept. of
158032/23 Suazo v. NYC Et Al
157130/22 Tlazon v. NYC Et Al
157544/18 Williams v. NYC

**Part 62
City Part**
Justice Ariel D. Chesler
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3274
Room 1127A
TUESDAY, JUNE 24
162282/14 Sharif v. NYC
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
153014/21 Bryant v. Keita
150744/25 Schlachet v. Amc Entertainment Hldgs. Inc. Et Al
THURSDAY, JUNE 26
157378/23 Ali v. NYC Et Al
152522/25 Amparo v. Ferrer
450743/22 Asad v. NYC Et Al
151007/23 C. v. NYC Et Al
157674/22 Canete v. Tangara
153909/23 Carreon Amnert v. NYC Dept. of Education
157630/21 Carter v. NYC Et Al
154246/25 Chyla v. NYCH&HC Corp.
151063/20 Davis v. NYC
152708/21 Cruz v. 209 E25 LLC Et Al
156631/16 Deberardine v. NYC
151447/22 Delacruz v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al
150828/23 Delgado v. 110 Post LLC Et Al
154637/22 Dihulu v. NYC
155474/22 Eichler v. Citybridge
153972/20 Fox v. Bremen House, Inc.
152775/19 Gantt v. NYC
154243/20 Gage v. NYC Et Al
450401/18 Gelly v. NYC Et Al
153930/20 Gill v. NYC
100954/19 Giurdanella v. NYC
153261/21 Green v. NYC
157849/23 Griggs v. NYC
153891/22 Grimes v. NYC Et Al
152439/22 Hargraves v. NYC Et Al
153725/23 Holguin v. NYC Et Al
156019/23 Ithier v. NYC Et Al
153943/21 Jean-Pierre v. NYC Et Al
155424/21 Kemelmacher v. NYC Et Al
157596/22 Koffey v. Cook
158467/19 McKay v. NYC
154128/20 Mackay v. NYC
157105/21 Marmeroff v. NYC Et Al
158766/22 Martinez v. NYC Et Al
160634/18 Martinez v. NYC
150736/22 McMahon v. L32
Delancey St. Corp. Et Al
154044/19 Morette v. NYC
159405/18 Mullings v. NYC Dept. of
158531/21 Orimogunje v. NYC Et Al
157670/21 Orimogunje v. NYC Et Al
151940/23 Orozco Jr. v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
158250/21 Pagan v. NYC Et Al
156149/16 Parker v. NYC Fire
154246/18 Pelepelin v. NYC

156800/22 Pena v. NYC Et Al
151503/22 Perez v. NYC Et Al
150002/23 Police Officer Dana Harge v. NYC Et Al
155600/20 Reid v. NYC
158632/21 Roach v. NYC Et Al
160897/21 Roodman v. 311 West 20th St. Housing Corp. Et Al
151900/21 Rose v. NYC Et Al
152703/22 Rothenberg v. NYC Et Al
151867/21 Ruiz v. NYC Et Al
151369/20 Sanchez v. NYC
157355/21 Smith v. NYC Et Al
157677/17 Sosa v. NYC
153882/22 Soto v. NYC Et Al
162174/18 Torggrimson v. NYC
161053/17 Tranter v. NYC
452425/23 Ullah v. NYC Et Al
158636/20 Valdez v. Gil
161386/20 Vasquez v. NYC Et Al
150079/22 Warren v. Clinton Housing Dev. Co., Inc. Et Al
152995/20 Williams v. NYC Et Al
161201/21 Yearwood v. Shop Fair Corp Et Al
160536/20 Zander v. NYC Et Al
160093/16 Zirpoli v. NYC

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

CRIMINAL TERM

Part Tap A
Justice Biben
Phone 646-386-4107
100 Centre St.
Room 1100, 9:30 A.M.
Part Tap B
Justice Statsinger
Phone 646-386-4044
100 Centre St.
Room 1130, 9:30 A.M.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 85
Justice Hayes
Phone 646-386-4085
Fax 212-401-9113
111 Centre Street
Room 1523, 9:30 A.M.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SURROGATE'S COURT

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

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

Bronx County

SUPREME COURT

EX PARTE AND URGENT MOTIONS PART

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

TRIAL TERM
718-618-1248

Day Calendar

Court Notices Key to Submission Motion Calendar

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

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

MENTAL HYGIENE PART

Justice TBA

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

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

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

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

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

Contact Information:
Email: bxforeclosure@nycourts.gov
Phone: 718-618-1322.

Trial Assignment Part

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
24938/19 1855 Bronxdale Rly. Corp. v. Casey
21241/18 Brobbey v. 3091 Rly.
21467/11 Brown v. NYC
31403/18 Cintron v. Harlem Group, Inc.
34205/18 Gaspari v. Cb Livery Leasing
303583/15 Lumpkin v. Lamadeleine
24699/19 Ortiz v. Ullah
21690/19 Pena Pichardo v. Irizarry

303635/16 Porcher v. Local Express LLC
25023/16 Rivera v. NYCTA
31216/18 Sawagodo v. Khan
22304/17 Smith v. Mta
25543/20 Stoudymire v. Kone
806357/21 Vargas Arias v. Ali
81258/271 Washington v. Lopez
24972/17 Willis v. St. Barnabas Hosp.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25

350175/14 Aj v. Reyes
33764/19 Bernudez v. Howard
301375/12 Celaya v. NYCHA
25310/19 Cosme v. Richter & Ratner Contracting
30388/19 Gainer-Stephenson v. Negroni
25149/20 Garcia Villa v. Louis
303998/16 Hall v. Genus
800142/22 Johnson v. Coleman
31193/17 March v. Pollini
27423/17 Pacheco v. F&Y Deli Grocery Corp.
300246/16 Pisaris v. Lance Taxi Inc.
20424/18 R. v. Exclusive Rly. Corp.
813016/21 Robles v. Best Deal Car Service, Inc. Et Al
26985/20 Sisavo v. Poopie Cab Corp.
24939/19 Then v. Fontanez-Ruiz
34550/20 Triumph Enterprises Corp. v. Webster Auto Repair
20934/16 V. Mussalli
24510/15 Vega v. NYCHA NYC Et Al
80387/21 Washington v. Rivera
23405/20 Wayou v. Meyer
27255/19 Whiteham v. NYCTA

ADR Part
Phone 718-618-3081
Room 701A

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

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
30127/20 Abel-Bey v. NYC Et Al
30663/20 Abel-Bey v. NYC Et Al
81753/23 Acevedo v. NYC Et Al
809146/24 Allie v. NYC
804640/24 Almonte v. 1230 LLC Et Al
808573/22 Apronti v. NYC
812042/24 Aquino v. NYC Et Al
814237/24 B. v. X369 Young Leaders Elementary School Et Al
815809/23 Brown v. NYC
816349/23 Bueti v. NYC Et Al
803260/24 Carey v. NYC Et Al
811085/23 Case v. NYC Et Al
820492/23 Christmas v. NYC Et Al
813340/24 Cintron v. NYC
816183/23 Colon v. NYC Et Al
814112/22 Cooper v. NYC Et Al
809754/24 Cruz v. The City of New York
811408/24 Cruz v. NYC Et Al
819338/24 Cuadra v. NYC
809849/24 Cubero v. NYC
816016/24 D. v. NYC Et Al
808326/24 D.R. v. Lion Charter School Et Al
818425/22 Deschamps v. NYC Et Al
805450/22 Diaz v. Herk Elevator Co. Et Al
800287/23 Dorsainvil v. NYC
805978/24 Duran v. Ferreras
811125/23 E. v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al
803569/21 Eusebio v. NYC Et Al
815065/23 Feliz v. Harlem Furniture One Corp
807236/24 Ferreras v. NYC Et Al
808099/25 Flores v. NYC Et Al
814223/24 Francisco v. NYC Et Al
807723/25 Garcia v. NYC Et Al
806249/24 Gibbs v. NYC Et Al
819430/22 Gilmore v. NYC Et Al
809821/24 Gomez v. NYC
809460/23 Gooden v. NYC Et Al
820223/24 Green v. NYC Et Al
810599/24 Guidv. NYC
800845/25 Gutierrez v. NYC Et Al
819384/24 H. v. NYC Et Al
818564/23 Hamlett v. NYC
813298/24 Harris v. NYC
807245/24 Herriot v. NYC Et Al
817008/24 Idowu v. NYC Et Al
817010/24 Idowu v. NYC Et Al
815380/22 Imbosiano v. NYC Et Al
817885/23 I.E. v. NYC Et Al
811036/24 Johnson v. NYC
802395/25 Johnson v. NYC Et Al
809301/23 Maaliya Auto Repair Inc. v. NYC Et Al
815851/23 Maldonado v. NYC
808083/25 Mann v. NYC Et Al
811938/24 Martinez v. Boom Community Services, Inc. Et Al
809340/25 Mattison v. NYC; Et Al
810557/24 McCullough v. Soumahoro
806374/25 McGrier v. NYC Et Al
811717/23 McNeill v. NYC Et Al
820953/24 Mendez v. NYC
805911/24 Morel v. NYC Et Al
815348/24 Paltou v. NYC Et Al
809558/23 Paul v. NYC Et Al
809334/25 Peguero v. NYC Et Al
809334/25 Peterson v. NYC Et Al
809911/24 Pion v. NYC Et Al
809734/23 Pryce v. 2406 Rly.
820373/24 Quinn v. Williams
813680/24 Quinones v. NYC Et Al
804731/24 R. v. NYC Et Al
808556/24 Ramirez v. Malcolm
810442/24 Reese v. NYC
804608/23 Reid v. NYC Et Al
808376/24 Rennis v. NYC Et Al
33955/20 Richards v. NYC
807787/24 Rivera v. NYC Et Al
810865/24 Rivera v. NYC Et Al
808373/23 Robinson v. NYC Et Al
810185/24 Robinson v. NYC
815746/24 Rochez v. NYC Et Al
804755/24 Rodriguez v. NYC
804667/24 Rodriguez v. Bowman Jr
803472/23 Rojas v. Bergen
800648/24 Santana v. NYC Et Al
805456/24 Santiago v. Gayle
811030/24 Segrede v. NYC
3546/23 Sesay v. NYC
800349/25 Smith v. NYC Et Al
810375/24 Springer v. NYC
809139/24 Stephens v. NYC
809459/23 Suber v. NYC Et Al
803262/22 Torre v. Grandco Hldg. Corp. Et Al
809144/24 Torrida v. NYC
808134/24 Trinidad v. NYC
NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
818009/24 Valdez v. NYC Et Al
815071/23 Vanosten v. NYC Et Al
820614/23 Velasquez v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al
808464/25 Villanueva v. NYC
816047/24 Villanueva v. NYC
804401/23 Vitale v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al
810264/25 Wallace v. NYC; Et Al
819812/24 Walston v. NYC Et Al
811438/24 Watson v. NYC
813088/24 Whittle v. NYC Et Al
806909/24 Williams v. NYC Et Al
812101/24 Williams v. NYC Et Al
808233/24 Wise v. Jpmorgan Chase Bank
803814/25 Wright v. Almonte-Rodriguez
809947/22 Young v. NYC Et Al
804963/24 Zambrano v. NYC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
33072/20 Ajero v. NYC
809919/22 Brown v. City
20739/12 Brown v. NYC
802590/22 Chowdhury v. B.G.R. Rly. LLC
31367/19 Correa v. NYC
28573/20 D. v. NYC
25149/18 Dancy v. NYC
30366/17 Deleon v. NYCHA
28140/19 Gonzalez v. NYCHA
20926/20 Gonzalez v. NYC
26650/20 Grant v. Walker
35446/19 Guzman v. City
32327/20 J. v. NYC
817234/22 Jones v. NYC
302579/16 Maldonado v. NYC
14873/04 McCray v. NYC
32496/19 Meek v. NYC
22488/18 Milagros Liriano v. NYC
32137/19 Negron v. NYC

31001/19 Nieves v. NYCHA
33445/19 Nunes v. NYC
30071/12 PAlvarez Associates v. NYC
26850/17 Parris v. NYC
801398/23 Plymouth Rock Assurance Preferred Corp. v. NYC Et Al
23956/19 Price v. NYC
817268/21 Roberts v. NYC Et Al
24148/20 Robinson v. NYC
34701/20 Rochez v. NYC
33751/19 Rodriguez v. Nelson
23939/19 Stephens v. NYC
24670/15 Stokes v. NYC
80553/22 Taylor v. NYC Et Al
809454/22 Washington v. NYC Et Al

Part 4
Justice Andrew J. Cohen
Phone 718-618-1212
Room 413, 9:30 A.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 24
800173/25 Arias v. Burgos
801446/25 Clark v. Duran
818917/23 Cyello v. The NYCHA
802138/25 Garcia v. Vitiello
803769/25 Garzon-Rivera v. Parkash
2125 LLC
818876/24 Hernandez v. Jerez
803320/25 Knowles v. White Plains
3 Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
802801/25 Medina v. Garcia
806409/24 Nicholson v. Lewis
819563/24 Novas v. Kast Rly.
804314/25 Ramirez v. Bolivar Builders LLC Et Al
32388/19 Rey v. Ullah
802197/25 Roberts v. Action Carting Environmental
807301/25 Rosario Duran v. Cabrera Javier
804528/25 Rosario v. A & L
800042/25 Seye v. Pv Hldg. Corp. Et Al
813051/24 Taveras v. The Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey Et Al
807511/25 Torres Montero v. Senior Living Options, Inc. Et Al
801155/25 Valentino v. Haider

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
817812/22 D'Arienzo v. Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey Et Al
805127/23 Feliz v. 83 W

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

#1 Global Legal Job Site

When results matter

Contact: Carol Robertson Phone: 212.457.7850 Email: crobertson@alm.com

CITATIONS NY ACCOUNTING CITATION File No. 2022-689/A SURROGATE'S COURT - BRONX COUNTY C I T A T I O N THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. By the Grace of God Free and Independent, To: Richard Sozzi; Raymond Sozzi; Sandra Sozzi Porro; Robert F. Chielli; Ronald Chielli; Giro William Colelli; James John Colelli; David Pasquale; Any Nicoletti; Jill Adams; Dolores Colelli Bordonaro; Maria Sozzi Mazzella; Lawrence P. Chielli; Celeste Christine Colelli Brigliano; Anne Dinuzzo; Grandelli & Eskenasi; Lousie Chielli Raimondi; NYC Department of Social Services; NYS Department of Taxation and Finance; Attorney General of the State of New York; American Zurich Insurance Co.; and The unknown distributees, next of kin and heirs at law of DAVID A. BATTINELLI a/k/a DAVID BATTINELLI, deceased, if living, or if dead, to their respective distributees, next of kin, heirs at law, legatees, devisees, beneficiaries, fiduciaries, assignees, creditors or other successors in interest, whose names and post office addresses are unknown and cannot be ascertained after due diligence; THIS RETURN DATE IS A VIRTUAL COURT DATE. IN-PERSON APPEARANCES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON THE RETURN DATE UNLESS A PARTY NOTIFIES THE COURT THAT IT WISHES TO APPEAR IN PERSON BEFORE THE SCHEDULED COURT DATE. A Petition having been duly filed by the Public Administrator of the County of Bronx, having offices at 851 Grand Concourse, Room 406, Bronx, New York 10451, and YOU ARE HEREBY CITED TO SHOW CAUSE by making a virtual appearance before the Surrogate's Court of the State of New York, Bronx County, at 851 Grand Concourse, Room 406, Bronx, New York 10451, on August 14, 2025, at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon of that day, why the Court should not grant the following relief: (1) that the account of the Public Administrator of the County of Bronx, a summary of which will be served therewith, as Administrator of the Estate of DAVID A. BATTINELLI a/k/a DAVID BATTINELLI, deceased, who at the time of his death was a domiciliary of 1559 Merry Avenue, Bronx, NY, be judicially settled; (2) that legal fees of \$101,097.51s listed in Schedule C-1 of the account, of which \$101,097.51 was paid pursuant to the Supreme Court Decree of Settlement and the remaining \$0.00 will be paid upon the entry of the Decree herein, to Rodman & Campbell, P.C. as attorneys for the Public Administrator be allowed; (3) that the Administrator be allowed its statutory charges calculated pursuant to SCPA 2307 and 1106 (1) & (2) be allowed; (5) that the disbursements in the amount of \$15,340.00, listed in Schedule D2, be allowed and paid to Grandelli & Eskenasi; (6) that the claim by American Zurich Insurance Co. for Worker's Compensation lien in the amount of \$105,847.92 be allowed and paid; (7) that the contingent and possible claim of Anne Dinuzzo for funeral expenses be denied for failure to present the same; (8) that, in the absence of anyone appearing and filing objections hereto, the entire net estate be paid to NYC Commissioner of Finance for the benefit of the decedent's unknown heirs; (9) that, in the event objections are filed herein, the Court hold a hearing to establish the identity of the decedent's distributees and grant pursuant to SCPA 2225 if appropriate; (10) that such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper be granted. PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (718) 618-2373 OR VIRTUALBRONXSURROGATESCOURT@NYCOURTS.GOV FOR INFORMATION ON HOW TO APPEAR ON THE COURT'S VIRTUAL PLATFORM. HON. NELIDA MALAVE-GONZALEZ Surrogate ELIX MADERA-FLIEGELMAN, Chief Clerk Dated, Attested and Sealed, May 29, 2025 (Seal) Attorney for Petitioner(s): RODMAN AND CAMPBELL, P.C. Tel. No. (718) 882-2681 Address of Attorney: 1428 East Gun Hill Road, Bronx, New York 10469 Email: info@rodmancampbellllaw.com or hvc@rodmancampbellllaw.com 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 object to the relief requested. You have a right to have an attorney-at-law appear for you, and you or your attorney may request a copy of the full account from the petitioner or petitioner's attorney. 10148 ju10-Tu jy1 To place your ad Contact: Carol Robertson Phone: 212.457.7850 Email: crobertson@alm.com	FOUNDATIONS THE ANNUAL RETURN OF Dreams R Us Foundation For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at 7 East Street, Shoreham, NY 11786 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Meghan E. Pace. 10494 ju24 THE ANNUAL RETURN OF LIMPE FOUNDATION For the calendar year ended December 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at 5 Indian Chase Drive Greenwich, CT 06830 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Stephen Limpe. 9685 ju24 THE ANNUAL RETURN OF Miller-Sweezy Charitable Trust For the fiscal year ended 11/30/2024 is available at its principal office located at 215 Quimby Lane Box #1984 Bridgehampton, NY 11932 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Ken Miller. 9684 ju24 THE ANNUAL RETURN OF The K.P. and Phoebe Tsolainos Foundation, Inc. For the calendar year ended 2024 is available at its principal office located at 12500 Park Potomac Ave. Unit 401N, Potomac, MD 20854 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the foundation is Elaine K. Jensen 10616 ju24 THE ANNUAL RETURN OF The Tamarin Foundation. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o Citrin LLC, 180 Park Avenue, Suite 200, Florham Park, NJ 07932 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Laura Santos. 10583 ju24 THE ANNUAL RETURN OF The Valerie and Jeffrey S. Wilpon Foundation For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o Charles T. Dowd, 125 Broad Street, New York, NY 10004 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Teresa Tsai. 10790 w.o. LIQUOR LICENSES NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license, at a publication number NA-0240-24-137248 for an on premises liquor license has been applied for by the undersigned to sell Beer, Wine & Cider at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 39 E 31st., New York NY 10016 for on premises consumption. Akura Sushi LLC. 10500 ju17-Tu ju24 LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES NAIK LAW & ADVOCACY GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/06/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the PLLC, 200 Broadhollow Road Suite 207, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: For the practice of the profession of Law. 10324 ju17-Tu jy22 NAOMI ROSENBAACH PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES PLLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/07/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process and shall mail to: 104 HARDS LN, LAWRENCE, NY 11559. Purpose: Psychology 9807 ju3-Tu jy8 Bane Law, PLLC filed with SSNY on 05/07/2025. Office in: NASSAU County. SSNY design. agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 499 CHESTNUT STREET, SUITE 215, CEDARHURST, NY, 11516. Purpose: Law. My20 T J24 New York Law Journal assumes no responsibility for any item error in an ad beyond the cost of the ad itself, or for the omission of copy.	LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES NOTICE OF FORMATION of DOMUS PRIMARY CARE, PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/23/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, New York, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful act. 9836 JO3 T Jy08 NOTICE OF FORMATION of MARINA GABRIELA BRINK ARCHITECTS PLLC. 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 PLLC to 235 E 95th St, Apt 32 J, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful act. 9150 JO3 T Jy08 NOTICE OF FORMATION of Hummingbird Speech Therapy PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/27/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 235 E 95th St, Apt 32 J, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful act. 9962 J10 T Jy15 NOTICE OF FORMATION of CORINNE AGMAN, NP IN FAMILY HEALTH, PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/23/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Corinne Agman, NP in Family Health, PLLC, 290 Ninth Avenue, Apt 14J, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: to practice the profession of Nurse Practitioner in Family Health. 9005 my20-Tu ju24 NOTICE OF FORMATION of CORINNE AGMAN, NP IN FAMILY HEALTH, PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/23/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Corinne Agman, NP in Family Health, PLLC, 290 Ninth Avenue, Apt 14J, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: to practice the profession of Nurse Practitioner in Family Health. 9005 my20-Tu ju24 NOTICE OF FORMATION of THERAPY WITH ABLE MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTING, PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/23/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 875 6th Ave, Ste 2300, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 9197 My27 T Jy01 LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES JERICHO TPKE. FLORAL PARK HOLDING LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/23/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 520 West 19th Street, Unit No. PHB, NY, NY 10011, who is also the principal business location. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10497 ju17-Tu Jy22 MANFRED RECHTSCHAFFEN, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/27/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Steve Kahn, CPA, 602 Merrick Avenue, East Meadow, NY 11556. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10322 ju17-Tu Jy22 FAMILY OFFICES GLOBAL CAPITAL LLC Art of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/12/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY is designated as the agent of the LLC for service of process. Any legal documents served to the LLC through SSNY will be forwarded to LEGALCORP SOLUTIONS, LLC 11 BROADWAY SUITE 615, NEW YORK, NY 10004. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. JO3 T Jy08 9496 NOTICE OF FORMATION of 15 WEST 43RD STREET OWNER LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 30 Hudson Yards, 72nd Fl., NY, NY 10001. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9549 Jun3 Tu Ju18 NOTICE OF FORMATION of 75 Wall 31p LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/10/2009. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: ROSABIANCA & ASSOCIATES, 40 WALL ST, 31ST FL, NEW YORK, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9423 my27-Tu jy1	LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES 860 EVERGREEN DR. LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/06/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Mordecai Pollock, 860 Evergreen Drive, West Hempstead, NY 11551. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10162 ju10-Tu jy15 BG NYC MGMT LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/12/2025. 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, 333 Jericho Tpk, Ste 122, Jericho, NY, 11753. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10173 ju10-Tu jy15 C&G TRAINING SOLUTIONS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/12/2025. 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, 1768 Seaman Drive, Merrick, NY 11566. Reg Agent: Susan Cronin, 1768 Seaman Drive, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10161 ju10-Tu jy15 OCR 534 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/06/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 109 N Broadway, Hicksville, NY 11801. Reg Agent: Chris Coiro, 330 Motor Parkway, Suite 300 Hauppauge, NY 11788. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10174 ju10-Tu jy15 SGLI of NY CONTRACTING LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/02/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 55 Cleard and Avenue, Carle Place, NY 11514. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10166 ju10-Tu jy15 CAIS HOLDING PERSON STREET, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/02/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 748 Hunt Ln, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10492 ju17-Tu Jy22 COMMERCE STREET 1983 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/16/2025. Office loc: Westchester County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Rui C Cunha, 324 Eastern Close, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10515 ju17-Tu Jy22 KLEINBERG 520 LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 11/6/24. Office in NY Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 520 West 19th Street, Unit No. PHB, NY, NY 10011, who is also the principal business location. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10497 ju17-Tu Jy22 MANFRED RECHTSCHAFFEN, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/27/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Steve Kahn, CPA, 602 Merrick Avenue, East Meadow, NY 11556. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10322 ju17-Tu Jy22 PICKWICK HOSPITALITY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/09/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, P.O. Box 320195, Brooklyn, NY 11232. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10326 ju17-Tu Jy22 POTENTIE PROPERTIES LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 6/12/25. Office in Bronx Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to PO Box 610126, Bronx, NY 10461. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. Principal business loc: 2065 Boston Post Rd., 2 ND fl., Bronx, NY 10461. 10491 ju17-Tu Jy22 NOTICE OF FORMATION of WHITE PLAINS 707-709 WESTCHESTER, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/21/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 13-15 W. 54th St., 1st Fl., NY, NY 10019. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9570 Jun3 Tu Ju18	LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES EVERGROVE HOLDINGS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/02/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 473 Von Elm Avenue, East Meadow, NY 11554. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10323 ju17-Ty jy22 BITCOIN HOLDINGS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/22/25. 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, 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 3W07, Lake Success, NY 11042. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9740 ju3-M jy8 1443 OAKLEY ASSETS LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/04/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 16 MIDDLE NECK RD, STE 150, GREAT NECK, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful purpose. 9804 ju3-Tu jy8 201W NY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/29/2025. Office loc: NY County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Chandan Sengupta, 39-46 65th Place, Woodside, NY 11377. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9773 ju3-Tu jy8 2682 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/31/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 27 HICKORY DR, GREAT NECK, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9803 ju3-Tu jy8 348 NASSAU BLVD. LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/16/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 348 NASSAU BLVD, WEST HEMPSTEAD, NY 11552. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9816 ju3-Tu jy8 36 WEST VIEW LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/20/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 36 WEST VIEW DR, OYSTER BAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9817 ju3-Tu jy8 46TH STREET UNIT 1802 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/20/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 36 WEST VIEW DR, OYSTER BAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9809 ju3-Tu jy8 46TH STREET UNIT 1803 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/20/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 36 WEST VIEW DR, OYSTER BAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9810 ju3-Tu jy8 99-26 41ST LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/15/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 10 GLORIA DR, WOODBURY, NY 11719. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9802 ju3-Tu jy8 ARETE PROPERTIES LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/15/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 299 PARK AVE 16 FLR, NEW YORK, NY 10171. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9820 ju3-Tu jy8 FAVORITE HOME GROUP LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/13/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 67A CUTTERMILL RD, GREAT NECK, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9815 ju3-Tu jy8 GOLDEN KEY SD LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/07/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 31 Strathmore Road, Great Neck, NY 11023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9739 ju3-Tu jy8 NIA ENTERPRISES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/09/25. 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, 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 1W5, Lake Success, NY 11042. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9121 my20-Tu ju24 NOTICE OF FORMATION of CYPRESS SKY, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 222 Fifth Ave., NY, NY 10001. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. Purpose: Consulting services. 9568 Jun3 tu Ju18	LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES NASSAU PARKWAY LI LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/01/2023. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 14 DERING LN, EAST ROCKAWAY, NY 11518. Purpose: Any Lawful 9812 ju3-Tu jy8 PHILLIP PETZOLD LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/22/2025. 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, 2331 Adolfo Pl, Westbury, NY 11590. Reg Agent: Phillip David Petzold, 2331 Adolfo Pl, Westbury, NY 11590. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9771 ju3-Tu jy8 RC ROYAL COURT LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/20/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 36 WEST VIEW DR, CUSTER BAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9811 ju3-Tu jy8 ROSLYN STRATEGIC INSIGHTS LLC Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 5/28/2025. Off. Loc.: Nassau Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to United Corporate Services, Inc., 10 Bank Street, Suite 560, White Plains, NY 10606, USA. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity. 9828 ju3-Tu jy8 SKOLRED CAP. LLC. Filed with SSNY on 02/28/2019. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2064 KIRKWOOD AVE, MERRICK, NY 11566. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9814 ju3-Tu jy8 SKOLRED VENTURES, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/26/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2064 KIRKWOOD AVE, MERRICK, NY 11566. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9813 ju3-Tu jy8 THIRD PLACE BROOKLYN LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 3/20/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Kaplan Fox & Fishbeiner LLP, Attys, Jason P. Reska, Esq., 800 Third Ave., 38th Fl., NY, NY 10022, which is also the principal business location. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9822 ju3-Tu jy8 VVMYD LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/28/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1 HOLLY LN, LAWRENCE, NY 11559. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9806 ju3-Tu jy8 DEAN'S PROTECTIVE SERVICES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/21/25. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1223 E 233rd Street, #1012, Bronx, NY 10466. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9742 ju3-W jy8 IBTAEA LLC. Filed 5/23/2025. Office: Nassau Co. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 111 WILLOW RD, WOODMERE, NY 11598. Purpose: General. 9538 Jun3 tu Ju18 CHRISOAR LLC filed with SSNY on 02/28/2025. Office in: NEW YORK County. SSNY design. agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 155 W 70TH ST, APT 8H, NEW YORK, NY, 10023. Purpose: General. 9052 My20 T J24 CRASHOUT STUDIOS LLC. Art of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/16/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY is designated as the agent of the LLC for service of process. Any legal documents served to the LLC through SSNY will be forwarded to LEGALCORP SOLUTIONS, LLC 11 BROADWAY SUITE 615, NEW YORK, NY 10006. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8756 My20 T J24 506WOOR LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/17/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 435 Maple Avenue, Westbury, NY 11590. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9092 my20-Tu ju24 NOTICE OF FORMATION of THE CURATED BREAST LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 515 Marj Blvd., Jersey City, NJ 07302. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9556 Jun3 tu Ju18	LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES ROMEO 2362, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/08/25. 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, c/o Karyn Dietrich, 2918 Shore Road, Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9091 my20-Tu ju24 THE LITERACY VIEW, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/08/25. 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, c/o Mitchell T. Borkowsky, Esq., 200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 207, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9093 my20-Tu ju24 1148 44DR NY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/16/25. 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, 120 New Hyde Park Rd, Franklin Square, NY 11010. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9439 my27-Tu jy1 155 WEST 70 STREET, 8F, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/14/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Michael C. Meltzer, Esq., 600 Mamaroneck Avenue, Suite 400, Harrison, NY 10528. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9441 my27-Tu jy1 196-52 45TH REALTY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/28/25. 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, 154-36 23rd Avenue, Whitestone, NY 11357. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9446 my27-Tu jy1 1 CLARA LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/16/25. 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, 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 1W5, Lake Success, NY 11042. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9443 my27-Tu jy1 24-7 PLAN B LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/16/25. 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, 76 S. York Avenue, Floral Park, NY 11001. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9445 my27-Tu jy1 251 NORTH MAIN, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/13/25. 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, 418 Shore Road, Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9436 my27-Tu jy1 30 COMMERCIAL CT LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/15/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 120 New Hyde Park Rd, Franklin Square, NY 11010. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9440 my27-Tu jy1 36 BAYBERRY LANE LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/22/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Carlos F. Lopez, 239 Nassau Rd, Suite B, Roosevelt, NY 11575. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9451 my27-Tu jy1 CANG GROUP LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 11/26/24. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 132 East 237th Street, Bronx, NY 10470. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9437 my27-Tu jy1 FA BELTS & ACCESSORIES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/14/25. 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, 9 Sagamore Way North, Jericho, NY 11753. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9433 my27-Tu jy1 L&M 248 EAST 62 STREET LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/27/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 337 E 41ST ST, NEW YORK, NY 10017. Purpose: Any Lawful 9821 ju3-Tu jy8
---	--	--	--	---	--	---

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

New York Law Journal

www.nylj.com

ALM.
An Integrated Media Company

TO PLACE, CORRECT OR CANCEL CLASSIFIED ADS:

Contact: Carol Robertson
Phone: 212 457 7850
E-mail: crobertson@alm.com
Monday thru Friday 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM
A sales representative will confirm receipt.

ERROR RESPONSIBILITY NOTE
Please check your ad the first day it appears. All ads placed by telephone are read back for verification of copy content. In the event of New York Law Journal error, we are responsible only for the first incorrect insertion. We assume no responsibility for any item error in an ad beyond the cost of the ad itself, or for the omission of copy.

New York Law Journal reserves the right to edit, reject, cancel or correctly classify any ad.

DEADLINES:
Line Ads: Tuesday through Friday editions: 11:00 AM one day prior to publication
Monday edition: Friday 12:00 Noon
Display Ads: 11:00 AM two days prior to publication

CONFIDENTIAL BOX NUMBER REPLIES:
You may respond to ads with Box numbers using any method below:
E-mail your resume to: NYLJobs@alm.com (indicate box# in subject)
Fax your resume to: 646-822-5028 (indicate box # on cover sheet)
Please do not enclose writing samples unless specifically requested.

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT: NEW YORK COUNTY. DOF NPL III LLC v. JOSHUA MANAGEMENT LLC et al. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and a Sale dated October 10, 2024, and filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court, New York County on January 27, 2025, bearing Index No. 850019/2022, I will sell at public auction on Wednesday, July 16, 2025 at 1:15 pm in Room 130 of the New York County Supreme Courthouse, 60 Centre Street, New York, New York 10007 the premises known as 270 West 153rd Street, a/k/a 2866 Frederick Douglass Blvd., New York, NY 10039 (Block 2038, Lot 61). Premises sold subject to filed Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale and Terms of Sale. Judgment amount \$5,917,348.95 plus interest and costs. The foreclosure sale will be conducted in accordance with the New York County Supreme Court Policies. All parties attending are requested to practice social distancing whenever possible. Auction location and time are subject to revision based on Court policy, current protocols and health conditions. Lawrence B. Goodman, Esq., Referee. Harry Zubli, Esq., attorney for plaintiff (516) 487-5777. ju17-Tu jy8

PUBLIC NOTICES

LEGAL NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION NOTICE OF PETITION

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF KINGS –In the matter of the Application of the UFT Charter School For an Order Directing the Disposition of Property Pursuant to Section 220 of the New York Education Law. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the Petition of the UFT Charter School, with exhibits attached thereto, the UFT Charter School, by its attorney Step-tote LLP, will petition the Court at the Motion Submission Part Courtroom at the Kings County Supreme Court, 360 Adams Street, Brooklyn, New York, 11201 on the 25th day of July, 2025, at 9:30 AM or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, for an Order directing the disposition of and all property of the UFT Charter School pursuant to Section 220 of the New York Education Law, and granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. Dated: June 6, 2025 Step-tote LLP Attorneys for UFT Charter School Alan M. Klinger, Esq. 1114 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 (212) 378-7677 ju10-Tu jy1

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION

OF THE LIMINA COLLECTIVE LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/7/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 501 E 87th St, Apt 4B, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful act. My20 T J24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

OF VOTES OF CONFIDENCE LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/7/2025. 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, #348233, New York, NY 10003. Purpose: any lawful act. My20 T J24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

OF MERCER COLLECTIVE, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/24/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: THE LLC, 240 WEST 40TH STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10018. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9426 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Of NPC Films, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/02/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: NPC Films, LLC, 56 Broadway, Suite 1301, New York, NY 10004. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9019 my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Piouette America, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. 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, 19 Woodland Drive, Plandome, NY 11030. Purpose: any lawful activities. my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WHITE PLAINS 711 WESTCHESTER LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/21/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9374 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WHITE PLAINS 777 WESTCHESTER LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/21/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 13-15 W. 54th St., 1st Fl., NY, NY 10019. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9573 Jun3 tu Jul8

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

FA BELTS & ACCESSORIES

LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/14/25. 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, 153 Sunrise Highway, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9433 my27-Tu jy1

GVK BUILT LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/14/25. 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, 153 Sunrise Highway, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9448 my27-Tu jy1

KKR HOSPITALITY SOLUTIONS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/16/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Kim Russen, 515 W. 18th Street, Apartment 810, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9442 my27-Tu jy1

MY HAPPY PLACE DAYCARE 2, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/05/25. 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, 2006 Seamans Neck Road, Seaford, NY 11783. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9434 my27-Tu jy1

RABI SHIMON LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/22/2025. 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, 111 Great Neck Rd, Suite 202A, Great Neck, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9450 my27-Tu jy1

SPIRIT OF USS, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/04/25. 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, 433 Stewart Avenue, North Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9435 my27-Tu jy1

UVDV GEORGETOWN PROPERTIES, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/22/2025. 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, 446 Nassau Street, Princeton, NJ 08540. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9449 my27-Tu jy1

VALLEY GREEN MT KISCO LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/06/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 20 Vandeventer Avenue, Suite #100 East, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9447 my27-Tu jy1

VISION FIRST LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 11/26/24. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 132 East 237th Street, Bronx, NY 10470. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 9438 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of LEGACY DONUT HUDSON 2 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/08/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: THE LLC, 240 WEST 40TH STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10018. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9426 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of OSZMIAN REALTY I LLC. AMENDED TO OSZMIAN REALTY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/05/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 120 E 81ST STREET, APT. 4F, NEW YORK, NY 10028. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9428 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of AROMAR REAL ES-TATE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/18/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: LAW OFFICES OF MARGARITA R. SOLIS, 5190 GOVERNOR DRIVE, SUITE 108, SAN DIEGO, CA 92122. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9424 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of EDGEINSIGHT TECHNOLOGIES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/07/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: THE LLC, 95 SPRUCE STREET, ROSLYN, NY 11576. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9392 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of SHOMER7, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/07/2025. 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, 135 CROSSWALK PARK DR., STE. 300, WOODBURY, NY 11797. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9393 my27-Tu jy1

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

1086 ARNOW AVENUE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/06/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 80 East St, Hicksville, NY 11801. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10159 j10-Tu jy15

245 DEPEW STREET LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/06/2025. 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, 245 Depew Street, Peekskill, NY 10567. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 10160 ju10-Tu jy15

SAIJ LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/23/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Las-sar & Cowhey LLP, 730 Third Avenue, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10017. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 10325 ju17-Tu jy22

HPNY 327 E 10TH STREET LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/14/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 358 FIFTH AVE, STE 1101, NEW YORK, NY 10001. Purpose: Any Lawful 9801 ju3-Tu jy8

KNDESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT LLC. Filed with SSNY on 05/14/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 60 RIVERSIDE BLVD, STE 1211, NEW YORK, NY 10069. Purpose: Any Lawful 9819 ju3-Tu jy8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of ARIBGLOBALCONSULTING LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/4/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 418 Broadway, Ste N, Albany, NY 12207. P/B/A: 130 W 86th St, Apt 4B, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: any lawful act. 9494 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Bum Bum Bhole LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/29/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 650 W 42nd St, 712, New York, NY 10036. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 9533 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Clay Bridges LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/17/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 601 W 149th St, Unit #67, New York, NY 10031. Purpose: any lawful act. 9831 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Foam Fairies LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/14/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 223 W 38th St, Box 493, New York, NY 10018-9928. P/B/A: 352 7th Ave, Fl 12A, Levittown, NY 11756. Purpose: any lawful act. 9830 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Forty Whiskers LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/7/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 223 W 38th St, Box 493, New York, NY 10018-9928. P/B/A: 352 7th Ave, Fl 12A, Levittown, NY 11756. Purpose: any lawful act. 9722 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of GNG STRATEGIC ADVISORS, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/14/2025. Office location: Westchester County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 988 Orienta Ave, Mamaronck, NY 10543. Purpose: any lawful act. 9756 J03 T Jy08

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of East Coast VEA LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/18/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 65-16 78th St, Middle Village, NY 11379. P/B/A: 310 Meserole St, Brooklyn, NY 11206. Purpose: any lawful act. 10034 J10 T Jy15

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Ridgewood Flow Yoga Studio LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/19/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 2248 Broadway, #1094, New York, NY 10024. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 10020 J10 T Jy15

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WILLIAM HUGH LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/25/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 19 Commerce St, Apt 8, New York, NY 10014. Purpose: any lawful act. 10176 J10 T Jy15

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Withjaz, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/4/2025. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1223 E 233rd St, Apt 36, Bronx, NY 10466. Purpose: any lawful act. J10 T Jy15

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of HYBRID LLIUSTRATIONS LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/15/2025. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1925 Haring Avenue, Bronx, NY 10461. Purpose: any lawful act. 10272 J17 T Jy22

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of The Support Collective LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/25/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1751 102nd Ave, 34F, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful act. 10292 J17 T Jy22

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Atelier Ote HOME LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/25/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 228 Park Ave S #365018, New York, NY 10003. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 10809 J24 T Jy29

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of JMJ Brooklyn Designs LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/14/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 447 Broadway 2nd Fl - #3000, New York, NY 10013. P/B/A: 211 East 43rd St, Ste 6th Fl, PMB 70069, New York, NY 10017. Purpose: any lawful act. 10749 J24 T Jy29

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of JOULERA LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/28/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 95 Wall St, Apt 1020, New York, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful act. My27 T Jy01

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WILD CAUGHT COOKIES LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/6/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 400 Park Avenue S, Apt 23C, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 10792 J24 T Jy29

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of LIFE UNLOCKED LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of NY (SSNY): 79 Laight St., NY, NY 10013. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9566 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of RESCUE CESSPOOL LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 02/25/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC, 2 Gold St., Ste. 3609, NY, NY 10038. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9750 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of CENTRA DESIGN & CONSULTING LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/20/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 1825 Riverside Dr., Apt. 4D, NY, NY 10034. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207, regd. agent upon whom and at which process may be served. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9567 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WEST 126 REALTY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 201 W. 79th St., NY, NY 10023. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9559 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of WHITE PLAINS 701 WESTCHESTER LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/21/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 13-15 W. 54th St., 1st Fl., NY, NY 10019. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the addr. of its princ. office. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9572 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of Kings Muay Thai Long Island LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/30/2025. Office location: Nassau County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/06/25. Princ. office of LP: 9 W. 57th St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10019. NYS fictitious name: SRA PRIVATE EQUITY PORTFOLIO VII LP. Duration of LP is Perpetual. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Summit Rock Advisors, LP at the princ. office of the LP. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. DE addr. of LP: c/o Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of LP filed with Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Suite 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Investments. 9050 my20-Tu ju18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Fastbreak Strategy & Solutions, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/21/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801, also the address required to be maintained in DE. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State, 401 Federal Street, Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. My20 T J24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of ISLAND BWOY KITCHEN LLC. 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 144 W 139Th St, Apt 12R, New York, NY 10037. Purpose: any lawful act. My20 T J24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of SGC Digital Consulting LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/11/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 144 W 18th St, Apt 4E, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: any lawful act. My20 T J24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Rise Therapy Partners LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/29/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 315 W 72nd St, Suite 1G, New York, NY 10023. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9021 my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of Strange Bird Podcast LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/01/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Strange Bird Podcast, Inc., 1301 Broadway, New York, NY 10004. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9022 my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of LOGIC LAB LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/28/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 95 Wall St, Apt 1020, New York, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful act. My27 T Jy01

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of 38 Fairview GN LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/06/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The Company, 6 Forest Drive, Port Washington, New York 11050. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9389 my27-Tu jy1

NOTICE OF FORMATION

Of 5838 Bayside LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/02/25. 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, 6 Forest Drive, Port Washington, New York 11050. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9390 my27-Tu jy1

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of BREIT AMIDALA CO-INVESTMENT PARTNERS LP. Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/05/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/29/24. Duration of LP is Perpetual. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the Partnership, c/o Blackstone Inc., 345 Park Ave., NY, NY 10154. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. DE addr. of LP: Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of LP filed with Secy. of State of the State of DE, Jeffrey W. Bullock, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9569 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of SRA PRIVATE EQUITY PORTFOLIO VII (E&F) LP. Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/16/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/06/25. Princ. office of LP: 9 W. 57th St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10019. NYS fictitious name: SRA PRIVATE EQUITY PORTFOLIO VII (E&F) LP. Duration of LP is Perpetual. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Summit Rock Advisors, LP at the princ. office of the LP. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. DE addr. of LP: c/o Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of LP filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Investments. 9558 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of SRA PRIVATE EQUITY PORTFOLIO VII LP. Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/16/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/06/25. Princ. office of LP: 9 W. 57th St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10019. NYS fictitious name: SRA PRIVATE EQUITY PORTFOLIO VII LP. Duration of LP is Perpetual. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Summit Rock Advisors, LP at the princ. office of the LP. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. DE addr. of LP: c/o Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of LP filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Investments. 9557 Jun3 tu Jul8

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of August Capital LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/30/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/10/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801, also the address required to be maintained in DE. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State, 401 Federal Street, Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of Hempstead Preservation, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/28/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 04/21/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Hudson Valley Property Group, LLC, 200 Vesey Street, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10281. Address required to be maintained in DE: 1209 Orange Street, Corporation Trust Center, Wilmington, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of DE, 401 Federal St., Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of LSI RENTAL LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/25/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 06/01/2015. 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., Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of VLC Hudson Yards, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/29/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/12/2024. 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 Highway, Lewes, DE 19958. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9023 my20-Tu ju24

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION

Of Gladiatrix Productions LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/23/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Wyoming (WY) on 03/13/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o ResidentialAgent, Inc., Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1204, New York, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of 183 ENERGY STORAGE 2 LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/14/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 01/29/24. Princ. office of LLC: 7 Times Sq., Ste. 3504, NY, NY 10036. 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 DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., #4, Dover, DE 19801. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9542 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of NORTH EAGLE STREET LAND OWNER LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/21/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/29/21. 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: CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9571 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of PRIVATE EQUITY VII (E&F) GP LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/15/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/06/25. Princ. office of LLC: 9 W. 57th St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10019. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Summit Rock Advisors, LP at the princ. office of the LLC. DE addr. of LLC: c/o Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Investments. 9555 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of PRIVATE EQUITY VII GP LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/15/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/06/25. Princ. office of LLC: 9 W. 57th St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10019. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Summit Rock Advisors, LP at the princ. office of the LLC. DE addr. of LLC: c/o Corporation Service Co., 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Investments. 9545 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of THE TRADING CARD TABLE LLC. Authority filed with the Secy of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/25. Office in Nassau County. Formed in RI on 02/03/25. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC, 596 CHARLES ST, 577 PROVIDENCE, RI, 02904. Purpose: Any lawful purpose 9554 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of US OUTLET STORES EMPIRE OUTLETS LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/16/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/05/25. Princ. office of LLC: Empire Outlets, 35 Richmond Terrace, Ste. 0322A, Staten Island, NY, 10301. 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: CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Retail store. 9541 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of VOTIVE ADVISORY LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/19/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/16/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19903. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 9562 Jun3 tu Jul8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of CURALTA MEDICAL LLC, Authority filed with the SSNY on 05/20/2025. Office loc: NY County. LLC formed in NJ on 06/14/2021. SSNY is designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 430 Park Avenue, 10th Fl., New York, NY 10022. Address required to be maintained in NJ: 365 West Passaic St., Ste 530, Rochelle Park, NJ 07662. Cert of Formation filed with NJ Dept. of Treasury, Div. of Revenue and Enterprise Services, 33 W State St., 4th, Trenton, NJ 08608. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 9772 ju3-23 tu jy8

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Record Store Life Management LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/07/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 04/29/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Sandra Fung Withers Bergman LLP, 430 Park Avenue, 10th Fl., New York, NY 10022. Address required to be maintained in DE: 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, New Castle County, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy. of State, Division of Corporations, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 9430 my27-Tu jy1

Bronx County

Court Calendars Continued From Page 13

810592/23 Guzman v. Morr Md
814732/21 Hector A. Aleman v. Bowen N.P.
23172/19 Margarita Martinez Delopez v. St. Barnabas Hosp.
22530/17 Martinez v. Schaffer Extended Care Center
811169/23 Neder v. Fromer Md
820571/23 Olaseun v. Bainbridge Nursing And Rehabilitation Center
811110/23 Ramos v. Kinkhabwala
805586/21 Rodriguez v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
801561/24 Rodriguez v. Labow M.D.
811293/22 Rohan v. Premier Home Health Care Services, Inc. Et Al
805832/22 Salih v. Pipitone M.D.
244791/23 Sanders v. Hebrew Home For The Aged
815185/22 Schiulaz v. Garza Posadas PA.
812411/24 Sohail M. Khan v. Sampat M.D.
804181/24 Thomas v. Dehoccardo Md
814894/21 Thompson v. Manhattan Eye Ear And Throat Hosp. Et Al
28448/18 Weiss v. Koshy
806190/22 Weiss v. Green M.D.
27883/18 Williams v. Bronx Center For
808479/23 Zapata Agront v. Assistcare Home Health Services

Part 35
Justice Raymond P. Fernandez
Phone 718-618-1216
Room 625, 9:30 A.M.

TUESDAY, JUNE 24
807331/25 Anthony v. River Park Bronx Apts. Inc. Et Al
804161/25 Bass v. Helen Alicakos Living Trust
817756/24 Bell v. 3463 Third Ave. Rlty.
819440/24 Eichmann v. Ayoroa Alarcon
802524/25 Flores v. Restrepo
807919/25 Hooper v. West 66th Sponsor LLC Et Al
801466/25 Mangual v. Espinalthoz
820425/24 McLeod v. Thomas
806485/25 Mendez-De Diaz v. Bolivar Builders LLC Et Al
821153/24 Rojas v. Doe
803805/25 Singh v. Sylla
815303/24 Sylla v. Bj's Wholesale Club, Inc. Et Al
802206/24 Vargas v. Carroll
801765/25 Viczcarondo v. Riverbay Corp.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25
817221/23 Baron v. Service Tire Truck Center Et Al
810155/22 Bawn v. Ozuna
803134/23 Ross v. First Choice Automobile Corp. Et Al
803261/24 Caceres v. Hirx
802717/24 Conner v. Hardeep
802299/23 Cusac v. Rammarain
816373/22 Flores Castillo v. United Parcel Service, Inc. Et Al
818870/23 Gonzalez v. Doe
820641/23 Lindsay v. Silverio

CRIMINAL TERM

Part SCA
Justice Rivera
Phone 718-618-1378
265 East 161st Street
Room 300, 9:30 A.M.
Part T11 (Trial)
Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.
Part C
Justice Lieb
Phone 718-618-1097
265 East 161st Street
Room 320, 9:30 A.M.
Part IDV-SC
Justice Flores
Phone 718-618-1067
265 East 161st Street
Room 420, 9:30 A.M.

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

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

Part 11
Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.

Part 12
Justice Michels
Phone 718-618-3623
265 East 161st Street
Room 570, 9:30 A.M.

Part 14
Justice Busching
Phone 718-618-1034
265 East 161st Street
Room 660, 9:30 A.M.

Part 15
Justice Tba
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 16
Justice Bruce
Phone 718-618-1043
265 East 161st Street
Room 540, 9:30 A.M.

Part 17
Justice Tbd
Phone 718-618-1106
265 East 161st Street
Room 350, 9:30 A.M.

Part 18
Justice Yearwood
Phone 718-618-3629
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 19
Justice Collins
Phone 718-618-1058
265 East 161st Street
Room 550, 9:30 A.M.

Part 21
Justice Powell
Phone 718-618-1133
265 East 161st Street
Room 690, 9:30 A.M.

Part 22
Justice McCormack
Phone 718-618-1001
265 East 161st Street
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

Part 23
Justice Villegas
Phone 718-618-1046
265 East 161st Street
Room 380, 9:30 A.M.

Court Calendars

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 Rosenbluth
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.

APPELLATE TERM

2ND, 11TH and 13TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

BROOKLYN, NY
Dismissal Calendar
MONDAY, JULY 21

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

24/104148 Avenue 218 Property, LLC V Ogan Williams, Alain Palmer, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"
24/01051 Newmont Properties, Lp v. Yvonne Callender, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"
24/01245 Dr. Alexander Berenblit, M.d., aao Bashria Osman v. Allstate Insurance Company
24/01247 Health Value Med, P.C., aao Akeel Tashed v. Allstate Insurance Company
24/01376 Sara E. Molina v. Blackdiam Properties, LLC
24/01394 Stiefios Kraniotakis v. South Shore Antiques, LLC, d/b/a South Shore Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram
24/01404 Chon Gee Chan v. Yu Hua Construction Corp.
24/01414 Esco Medical Supply Corp., aao Melissa Sosa v. Geico Indemnity Company
24/01416 Anukware Ketsogubo, M.d., P.C., aao Bryan Logan v. Palisades Ins. Co.
25/00001 Kevin Oreckinto v. Linda Kpaka a/a/k Linda Annette Kpaka, Lahai Kpaka, Nile Kpaka, Lahai Kpaka, Timmy Jackson, Timothy Jackson, "John" Jackson, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"
25/00037 Sanford Equities Corp. v. Robert M. Cushing and Noan-Huey Wu
25/00043 Sanford Equities Corp. v. Noan-Huey Wu and Robert Cushing
25/00084 Mid Island Lp v. Nan Li
25/00115 Erick Williams v. Alexandra L.P.ra
25/00139 Sandy Bergen LLC v. Chiaka Nedd and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"
25/00147 In The Matter of the Application Of Isabel L.P.z, Raul L.P.z, and Carmen Galindo v. for a pursuant to article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, Appointing A Court-Designated Administrator For The Premises Known As 374 Wallabout Street, Brooklyn, New York, Block 2266, Lot 1

25/00148 In The Matter of the Application Of Isabel L.P.z, Raul L.P.z, and Carmen Galindo v. for a pursuant to article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, Appointing A Court-Designated Administrator For The Premises Known As 374 Wallabout Street, Brooklyn, NY 11206 and Department Of
25/00175 1334 B, LLC v. Nora Pritchard and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe" and Benjamin Z. Epstein, Esq.
25/00176 1334 B, LLC v. Nora Pritchard and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe."
25/00061 Erica D. Harris v. Papa Faye
25/00064 Atlantic Medical & Diagnostic, P.C., aao Cerinea Shirley v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company
25/00065 James Seganti, Iii and Melissa Seganti v. Ralph Castellanos and Deidre Castellanos and Thomas v. Pillari, Esq.
25/00066 Veterinary Medical Center Of L.L.C. v. Walter Vilkas
25/00079 Gerrard J. Blake v. Apr. McDuffy
25/00088 Elizabeth Denihan v. Michael Gigliotti
25/00228 Marie Arcoleo v. Perfect Body Image, LLC, Alexa "Doe", Taylor Roesel, "John Doe", and Patrick Scomello
25/00473 Diamond Development Properties Corp. v. Edward Bundock, Lisa Purzak, "John" "Doe 2" and "Jane" "Doe 1-2"
25/00628 State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, As Subrogee Of Radhames Delacruz-Infante v. Elvin Loveras-Reyes, a/a/k Elvin Loverasreys

25/00043 Glen-Marie David v. Drucilla McLeod and Department Of Housing Preservation and Development of the City Of New York

25/00044 Dov Land Usa, LLC v. Carrie Henrichson and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Alex Haselkorn, M.d., P.C., aao Francisco Gonzalez v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/000418 Alex Haselkorn, M.d., P.C., aao Francisco Gonzalez v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00043 Glen-Marie David v. Drucilla McLeod and Department Of Housing Preservation and Development of the City Of New York

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

Part 71
Justice Steed
Phone 718-618-1004
265 East 161st Street
Room 610, 9:30 A.M.

Part 73
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 75
Justice Bruce
Phone 718-618-1043
265 East 161st Street
Room 540, 9:30 A.M.

Part 77
Justice Parker
Phone 718-618-1025
265 East 161st Street
Room 680, 9:30 A.M.

Part 78
Justice Marcus
Phone 718-618-1001
265 East 161st Street
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

Part 96
Justice Morales
Phone 718-618-1082
265 East 161st Street
Room 460, 9:30 A.M.

SURROGATE'S COURT

Surrogate
Nelida Malave-Gonzalez
Phone 718-618-2350
Courtroom 406

Second Department

25/00492 Erf Physical Therapy, Pc, aao Mary, Scotland v. Nationwide Insurance Company
25/00494 New Image Chiropractic, P.C., aao Krystal Hayes v. Kemper Insurance Company
25/00683 15 Bpd Owner LLC v. Quanda Francis, Todd Francis and Aaron Francis, "John Doe", "Jane Doe"
25/00685 Rex 810 Fulton Li Owner, LLC v. Elizabeth Clarke-Robinson and Devin Robinson
25/00696 Cach, LLC v. Lizit Faena A/K/A Livi Faena
25/00756 Bank Of America, N.a. v. Dimitrios Kourouklis
25/00896 Anukware Ketsogubo Md, Pc aao Monique Espinal v. Affirmative Direct Insurance Company

9TH and 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
White Plains, NY
Dismissal Calendar
MONDAY, JULY 14
Garguilo, P.J., Driscoll, Goldberg-Velazquez, JJ.

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

23/00760 People v. Ramiro Linares
23/01052 People v. Bryan Gershen
24/00214 People v. John Marky
24/00903 People v. Juan Miguel Maritotti
24/01118 People v. Cubby Gibson
24/01342 People v. Veronica Sabbag
25/00097 People v. Sean O'Donnell
25/00120 People v. Stone Equities, LLC
25/00186 People v. Richard Clinton
25/00517 People v. Ronald Devaughn
24/00478 Alexa Pata v. Mahmuda Yildiz
24/01029 Woodlands Apartment Corp., v. Patricia Lorelli, "John" "Doe" and "Jane" "Doe"
24/01037 Mauro Spinal Chiropractic, P.C., aao Annett Shay-Gladston, Shana Ighinovia and Cristian Mateu v. Geico General Insurance Company
24/01077 Primus Automotive Financial Services, Inc. v. Roberta L. Whitfield
24/01371 John N. Mandas v. Salvador Carmelino
24/01388 Mohammad Ali and Sofia Ali v. Mariam Sana Ahmed
24/01395 Crane Enterprises, LLC v. Michael Crane, "John Doe 1" and "Jane Doe 1", "John Doe 2" and "Jane Doe 2"
24/01439 Infinity Solutions Ny, LLC and Todd Roberts v. Mynehner Carpenter and Mynehner Carpenter, d/b/a Love U
25/00008 Apple Bank v. Contemporary Dental Implants Scarsdale, L.P.and Xyz Corp
25/00048 Diamond Development Properties Corp. v. Lisa Purzak, Edward Bundock, "John Doe 2" and "Jane Doe 1-2"
25/00055 Ig Other Associates, LLC v. Synergy Fitness Merrick, Inc.
25/00057 147 Garden Street, LLC v. Troy Dancy, John Doe Or Jane Doe
25/00060 482 Front Street v. Keisha Adams, Tiara Adams, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"
25/00061 Erica D. Harris v. Papa Faye
25/00064 Atlantic Medical & Diagnostic, P.C., aao Cerinea Shirley v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company
25/00065 James Seganti, Iii and Melissa Seganti v. Ralph Castellanos and Deidre Castellanos and Thomas v. Pillari, Esq.
25/00066 Veterinary Medical Center Of L.L.C. v. Walter Vilkas
25/00079 Gerrard J. Blake v. Apr. McDuffy
25/00088 Elizabeth Denihan v. Michael Gigliotti
25/00228 Marie Arcoleo v. Perfect Body Image, LLC, Alexa "Doe", Taylor Roesel, "John Doe", and Patrick Scomello
25/00473 Diamond Development Properties Corp. v. Edward Bundock, Lisa Purzak, "John" "Doe 2" and "Jane" "Doe 1-2"
25/00628 State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, As Subrogee Of Radhames Delacruz-Infante v. Elvin Loveras-Reyes, a/a/k Elvin Loverasreys

25/00043 Glen-Marie David v. Drucilla McLeod and Department Of Housing Preservation and Development of the City Of New York

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00048 Marie Mondeluis, As Administratrix of the Estate Of Antoine Jean v. Chantale Leon and Dieula Leon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

Kings County

SUPREME COURT

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

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

Part Assignments/RJI
Intake Part
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1592
Room 282
TUESDAY, JUNE 24

501496/25 347 Berry LLC v. Capmoon Investment Hldgs. LLC Et Al
510003/24 Adebajo v. Lopez
515377/25 Avadyave v. Franco
504952/25 Baskerville v. Millington
521893/23 Bonofacio Garcia v. Polizzotto
506969/25 Burgess v. Morales
502007/25 Chan v. Shamsiev
524729/23 Charrad v. NY Presbyterian Bklyn. Methodist Hosp. Et Al
501377/25 Chery v. Flatbush Gardens Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
510736/25 Claret v. Ortiz
507030/25 Cooper v. NYCHA
530885/24 Cuevas Curbelo v. Dragonetti Brothers Landscaping Nursery & Florist Inc. Et Al
530183/24 Daldan v. Wells Fargo Bank
504704/25 Dawson v. Pavliashvili
502670/25 Db 232 Seigel Mezz LLC v. Schweid
502