

IN BRIEF

Fed. Judge Sanctions Two Attorneys Over AI Hallucinations, Declines Disciplinary Referral

A federal judge in Pennsylvania sanctioned two attorneys after the court identified numerous artificial intelligence hallucinations in a briefing, concluding both non-monetary and monetary sanctions were appropriate.

On Monday, U.S. District Judge Mark A. Kearney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania sanctioned Pennsylvania and New York-based attorneys after the court identified various AI hallucinations, or entirely fabricated information, in a briefing they filed. The court issued a \$4,000 monetary sanction and non-monetary sanctions against attorney Yen-Yi Anderson of Anderson and Associates, in New York, as well as non-monetary sanctions against local counsel Jeffrey J. Goldin of Goldin Law Group, in Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, who represented the defendant.

The court determined that the two attorneys failed to thoroughly review a briefing they both signed, which a law clerk had allegedly drafted using AI, and concluded that sanctions were necessary in order to deter other attorneys from repeating such conduct. However, Kearney also concluded that both attorneys had taken steps to remedy their mistakes and declined to refer the attorneys to the disciplinary board.

"Today's tailored sanction serves more as a lesson to other lawyers who may resort to the easy way hoping to meet economic and time goals. We impose a monetary sanction upon the drafting New York co-counsel payable to a New York organization focusing on attorneys practicing in her intellectual property discipline. We do not impose monetary sanctions upon local co-counsel. We also do not refer either lawyer to their respective disciplinary authorities subject to their compliance with today's order," Kearney said.

"But, to meet our hope of deterring more of these sanctionable lapses, we direct each co-counsel send cover letters to identified local organizations

tailored to this dispute attaching today's order, this memorandum, and their updated artificial intelligence policies along with our request these organizations distribute to their members," Kearney said. "We also direct New York co-counsel copy her cover letter with attachments to the judges and counsel in the two other known cases where the New York lawyer used artificial intelligence."

In *Lifetime Well v. IBSpot.com*, Lifetime Well sued defendant IBSpot.com in September, alleging that the defendant violated copyright and trademark law by selling Lifetime Well's hearing aid on IBSpot.com's website. IBSpot.com failed to respond, and the court entered default judgment in Lifetime Well's favor in October.

IBSpot.com retained Goldin after the judgment was entered. Goldin then moved for admission pro hac vice of Anderson, and the two attorneys moved to vacate the judgment, which the court later granted. Defense counsel then filed a motion to dismiss the suit on Nov. 4; however, opposing counsel identified a hallucination in the brief. The court later identified eight instances where the "offered authorities which did not stand for the propositions asserted, arose from inapposite jurisdictions, or included inaccurate quotations."

The court noted that Anderson and Associates was entirely responsible for drafting the motion to dismiss and wrote the entire motion without input from Goldin, who signed the document once it was ready to be filed. Anderson claimed a new law clerk she had enlisted to help prepare the motion had used AI without the firm's consent or knowledge, and that the firm identified two other cases in which the clerk had used AI without its knowledge. Anderson fired the clerk as a result and claimed to come "before this court with its tail between its legs, fully acknowledging the errors." » Page 4

Court Reaffirms SEQRA Standing for Property Owners »5



Prosecutors allege Alon, second right, Tal and Oren Alexander, second left, lured women to parties and vacation homes where they were attacked.

'Womanizers' Not Traffickers? Sex Crimes Trial Opens For Alexander Brothers

BY EMILY SAUL

A TRIO of wealthy brothers, including two luxury real estate brokers, were "womanizers" but not sex traffickers, their defense attorneys told a jury on Tuesday in opening statements in their federal sex crimes trial.

Prosecutors allege that Oren Alexander, Tal Alexander and Alon Alexander drugged and raped dozens of women as part of a conspiracy that started in 2008 when they were in college and lasted more than a decade.

Teny Geragos, a lawyer for Oren Alexander, said her client was not a rapist but a "womanizer" and a "playboy" eager to have sex with as many women as possible.

"That's not trafficking, that's

dating," she said of his romantic past. "That's hooking up. But the government is trying to turn their past life of going out and partying into one of the most serious crimes we have: sex trafficking."

Oren and Tal Alexander cofounded luxury real estate brokerage Official. Alon Alexander, a lawyer, worked as a private security executive. The trio, who have become known as the "Alexander Brothers," were charged in 2024 with crimes including sex trafficking and sex trafficking conspiracy.

Oren and Tal are also charged with sexual exploitation of a child for what prosecutors say was the filmed rape of a barely conscious 17-year-old.

Prosecutor Madison Smyser told the jury the brothers used their wealth and influence to » Page 6

Morrison Cohen Saw Revenue Jump as Firm Overhauled Comp, Billing Practices

BY RYAN HARROFF

MORRISON Cohen took in \$127.8 million in revenue in 2025, a 14.8% increase from the firm's 2024 figure, according to managing partner Steven Cooperman, who partly attributed the growth to "a number of strategic initiatives," including adjusting its compensation structure and billing practices.

The firm also saw a 23% increase in revenue per lawyer, or RPL, to \$1.2 million per attorney for 2025, Cooperman said, while the firm had a 23.8% boost in profitability, based on the year-over-year change in the total partner profit pool.



Steven Cooperman, managing partner at Morrison Cohen

In the same year, the firm saw eight lawyers depart and some voluntary transitions out of equity partner positions, which Cooperman said was one of multiple factors contributing to the increased profitability and RPL. In total, the firm's headcount last year was 107, about eight fewer than the prior year. » Page 6



The firm's revenue per lawyer grew 6.5% year-over-year to \$1.3 million.

New York Judiciary Asks 'Only for What Is Necessary' in \$3.2B Budget Request

BY BRIAN LEE

NEW YORK judicial branch leaders are requesting a \$3.2 billion budget for the fiscal year starting in April, an increase of nearly \$200 million, or 6.7% from the current fiscal year.

Its request to Albany lawmakers and Gov. Kathy Hochul would allow for filling 900 full-time equivalent nonjudicial posts that have been lost over several years due to attrition, court leaders say.

The budget, proposed by Chief Administrative Judge Joseph A. Zayas, would maintain the momentum of the past two years in which lawmakers provided the judiciary significant increases, while seeking additional funding "only for what is absolutely necessary to continue the Judiciary's commitment to ensure equal access to justice."

The request for only about \$50 million in new spending was an

acknowledgment of the state's current fiscal challenges, the budget document reads.

A year ago, Albany lawmakers granted the judiciary its present \$3 billion fiscal 2026 budget, which was a \$268.2 million, 10% increase



The judiciary's fiscal 2027 budget, proposed by Chief Administrative Judge Joseph A. Zayas, asks for limited new spending, including \$25 million to enhance civil legal services.

from the prior year. Before that, the 2025 fiscal budget of \$2.7 billion was a 6.9% increase.

In a statement to the Law Journal on Tuesday, Zayas said: "We are looking forward to working with the Governor" » Page 4

Law Firms in 'Space Race' For NYC Office Leases

BY RYAN HARROFF

LAW FIRMS leased almost 800,000 square feet of New York City office space in Q4 of 2025, when big firms such as Kirkland & Ellis and Goodwin Procter again expanded their Manhattan footprints by tens of thousands of square feet, according to data provided to Law.com.

McGuireWoods also signed an expansion lease in New York in Q4 2025, and other Big Law firms such as Gibson Dunn and Baker Hostetler renewed in place, according to real estate advisory firm Cresa.

Kirkland & Ellis and Goodwin Procter already made big leasing news in the second quarter of 2025. That's when Kirkland leased a 131,000 square-foot new office on Third Avenue—in addition to its existing location on Lexington Avenue. Additionally, Goodwin Procter in April announced it would relocate from 620 Eighth Ave. to 200 Fifth Ave. in Midtown



Law firms are continuing to invest in New York to grab up space before it's gone, sources say.

South in 2027, adding close to 30,000 square feet for a total of 244,453 square feet at the new office.

However, these firms were not done. In Q4 2025, Kirkland added 52,089 square feet to its new location at 900 Third » Page 4

Sheppard Mullin Surpasses \$1.3B in Revenue in 2025

BY SAMSON AMORE

SHEPPARD, Mullin, Richter & Hampton carried its momentum from 2024 into 2025, securing its 34th consecutive year of revenue growth.

Bolstered by marquee matters including representation of Fox Corp. mogul Rupert Murdoch in a trust dispute and Hollywood studio Village Roadshow Pictures during its bankruptcy, Sheppard Mullin's



Luca Salvi, Sheppard Mullin's chair of the executive committee

gross revenue for fiscal year 2025 was \$1.38 billion, up roughly 13.7% from \$1.21 billion last year. "In all metrics, we exceeded" » Page 4

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

First Department

CORPORATE ENTITIES: Settlement approved in shareholder derivative action. *Miami Firefighters' Relief & Pension Fund v. Icahn*, Supreme Court, New York.

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: Issues of fact presented concerning completion of property renovation. *Vogel v. Armagh Bldrs. LLC*, Supreme Court, New York.

ATTORNEY COMPENSATION: Sealing of records granted in action involving recovery of attorney fees. *Freedman Normand Friedland, LLP v. IDT Corp.*, Supreme Court, New York.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION: Arbitration award confirmed for petitioner for construction of swimming pool. *Kevin O'Sullivan & Assoc. LLC v. Peconic Sunset LLC*, Supreme Court, New York.

Second Department

CIVIL PROCEDURE: Motion to renew summary judgment denied; failure to follow court rules. *Singh v. Shaked*, Supreme Court, Kings.

MOTOR VEHICLE TORTS: Motor vehicle accident stayed pending arbitration. *Diljohn v. Willmot*, Supreme Court, Kings.

U.S. Courts

SECURITIES LITIGATION: Second Circuit affirms summary judgment, damages award in Getty Images warrant dispute. *Alta Partners LLC v. CRCM Institutional Master Fund (BVI) Ltd.*, 2d. Cir.

SECURITIES LITIGATION: Court denies motion to dismiss SEC market manipulation claims against Future FinTech CEO. *Sec. And Exch. Comm'n v. Huang*, SDNY.

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: Court bars lost profits as damages, allows evidence to support liquidated damages clause. *The Avon Co. v. Fareva Morton Grove Inc.*, SDNY.

LAND USE AND PLANNING: Court dismisses homeowner's due process, takings claims over Bedford zoning dispute. *Hammer v. Town of Bedford*, New York, SDNY.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: FTCA wrongful death suit dismissed for failure to timely exhaust administrative remedies. *Phillips v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, EDNY.

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

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events.....	6, 7
Court Calendars.....	9
Court Notes.....	9
Decisions.....	17
Disciplinary	
Proceeding.....	7
Expert Analysis.....	3
Lawyer to Lawyer.....	3
Legal Notices.....	13
Outside Counsel.....	4
Real Estate Trends.....	5

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.

Point Your Career in The Right Direction.

lawjobs.com

Find the right position today. Visit LawJobs.com Your hiring partner

BILLING RATES

BEAT THE COMPETITION WITH OUR SUPERIOR BILLING DATA

While your peers struggle to complete RFPs, you'll be winning business.

Billing Rates from ALM Legal Intelligence is an accurate and growing database of more than 70,000 attorney-specific rates, searchable by practice area, region and biographical information.

Arm your firm with unrivaled data to:

- Assess, benchmark and negotiate billing rates with precision and confidence
- Market strategically and successfully against the competition in your area
- Justify rates to clients using data pulled from peer-firms

GET A FREE SAMPLE REPORT TODAY
CONTACT: Phil Flora
212-457-7767 | pflora@alm.com
almlegalintel.com/alm/billingrates

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

ALM. LEGAL INTELLIGENCE
More research. More insight. More business.

ALM. LEGAL INTELLIGENCE
More research. More insight. More business.

New York Law Journal Inside

Family Law »3

Parental Rights and The NYS Legislature & Family Court Approaches
by Philip Katz

Online

Court Calendars

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

Artificial Intelligence »3

AI and Evidence In NY Law: The Disappearing Original Fact
by Ronald Castorina, Jr.

Outside Counsel »4

Second Circuit Reshapes Cross-Border Discovery Under Section 1782
by Scott Schirick and Alan Mendelsohn

Online

Today's Tip

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

REAL ESTATE TRENDS »5

Zoning and Land Use Planning: Court Reaffirms SEQRA Standing For Property Owners
by John C. Armentano

Realty Law Digest
by Scott E. Mollen

Online

More Real Estate columns are archived at nylj.com.

Leader of Beverly Hills Boutique Exits to Join Data Center Developer On Growth Tear
by Michael Gennaro

Calif. Appellate Court Sides With Plaintiffs in Key Consumer Standing Case
by Cheryl Miller

Online

Have You Recently Been Involved in a Major Verdict or Settlement?

Contact the Law Journal now, as your verdict, settlement or arbitration award could be considered for a front-page article or publication in a Verdict-Search's massive database. Send your submissions to Law Journal at editorialnylj@alm.com or to verdict@verdictsearch.com.

EO-Targeted Law Firms Clash With DOJ Over Appeal Proceedings

BY ABIGAIL ADCOX

FOUR large law firms targeted by executive orders last year are clashing with the Justice Department on how the cases should proceed in an appeals court.

The Trump administration has asked the court to pause litigation in the law firm EO cases until the court makes a ruling in a separate case, involving attorney Mark Zaid, whose security clearance was revoked by Trump. The DOJ is arguing that the Zaid case has "at least some overlapping issues" with the EO cases, according to a joint motion filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

"Defendant-appellants in that case sought expedited briefing that was granted in part. The court has set a briefing schedule that concludes April 10, 2026, and directed the clerk to set argument at the first appropriate date following

the completion of briefing," Deputy Associate Attorney General Abhishek Kambli wrote.

Meanwhile, attorneys for the four law firms opposing the government's appeals—Perkins Coie, Jenner & Block, Wilmer, Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr and Susman Godfrey—argued in that same joint motion that their cases should proceed.

The firms propose "that these cases be partially consolidated and calendared for argument on the same day before the same panel," attorneys for the four firms wrote in the joint filing on Tuesday, adding that the firms "strongly oppose the government's proposal to hold these four cases in abeyance pending the resolution of a later-filed—and almost entirely unrelated—appeal."

Attorneys for the four firms argued that many of the legal arguments presented in the law firm EO cases were not made in the Zaid case, "so a decision in Zaid



Mark Zaid, managing partner in Mark S. Zaid P.C. in Washington, D.C.

will not resolve these appeals."

"Among other distinctions, Zaid concerns only a challenge to the revocation of an individual's security clearance, while these cases involve (among other things) a pol-

icy requiring blanket suspension of security clearances for personnel of the law firms subject to the Executive Orders," attorneys for the four firms wrote in Tuesday's motion.

"There is simply no good cause to further delay these appeals; the law firms are entitled to a prompt final resolution of the legality of the government's efforts to punitively target them," attorneys for the four firms added.

In addition, the DOJ has argued that the law firm EO cases, when they proceed, should be consolidated. Meanwhile, the firms have argued that the EO cases should be partially consolidated and scheduled for same-day argument before the same panel of judges, but each firm files separate briefs. The four firms suggest that each of their cases "raises separate legal and factual issues," and that the district courts ruled on varying grounds.

"Each court ruled against the government, collectively holding that the EOs violate 10 constitutional guarantees, but not every court was presented with or reached every issue. As a result, there is only one claim—retaliation for protected speech, in violation

of the First Amendment—that all four courts reached and resolved in appellees' favor," attorneys for the four firms wrote.

The attorneys further argued that the factual variations in the cases "could potentially bear on each firm's legal challenges," and by requiring all four firms to file under a single response brief could "force appellees to make decisions about the briefing of legal and factual issues that their individual cases do not involve."

The latest joint motion comes after several delays in the appeals cases. The cases were first put on a month-long pause during the federal government shutdown. And most recently, the U.S. government was granted an extension of time to submit its proposed briefing schedule, as the government attorney assigned to the cases was on paternity leave through January.

Abigail Adcox can be reached at abigail.adcox@alm.com.

For Minneapolis Law Firms, Focus on Navigating Unrest 'Has Only Intensified'

BY PATRICK SMITH

AS MINNEAPOLIS becomes further ensnared in national controversy and protests, the several Am Law 200 firms rooted in or having a significant presence in the city are prioritizing the well-being of attorneys and staff, while also offering opportunities for pro bono work and remote work arrangements, leaders of many of those firms say.

After two city residents were shot and killed by federal authorities—Renee Good earlier this month, and Alex Pretti on Saturday—protests against federal immigration enforcement in the city have intensified.

Now, an open letter signed by 60 CEOs and published by the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce on Sunday said the business community there has been "working every day behind the scenes with federal, state and local officials to advance real solutions." The recent challenges, the statement said, have "created widespread disruption and tragic loss of life."

The statement added the group was calling for "an immediate de-escalation of tensions and for state, local and federal officials to work together to find real solutions." Leaders at 3M, Cargill, General Mills, Medtronic, Mayo Clinic, Target, and UnitedHealth Group, among many others, signed the statement.

Am Law 200 firms and midsize firms with the largest headcount in the city include Fredrikson & Byron; Faegre Drinker Biddle; Dorsey & Whitney; Winthrop & Weinstine; Taft, Stettinius & Hollister; Robins Kaplan; Stinson; Lathrop GPM; Larkin Hoffman; and Mason LLP.

Law.com reached out to each firm to ask how they are navigating the unfolding events. Those who responded said attorney and staff well-being was the priority.



Demonstrators against the ongoing Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) deployment march during a protest in Minneapolis on Sunday, Jan. 25.

"Like most of Minnesota, our firm is very focused on the situation playing out on the streets of our communities," said Dorsey & Whitney managing partner Peter Nelson said via email.

"That was the case before the most recent shooting, and it has only intensified," he added. "Our firm is particularly focused on the safety and wellbeing of our attorneys and business professionals. One precaution is that we are being very flexible on in-office attendance. If people can do their job remotely, we are encouraging them to do so if it increases their sense of safety. For those who can't do their job remotely, we are taking other measures to navigate this difficult time."

Nelson said Dorsey is also providing counseling resources for those who have been affected and that the firm is "endeavoring to accommodate those who

need some time away from work." Meanwhile, Dorsey and individual personnel are also "pursuing pro bono opportunities."

Peter Michaud, chair of Ballard Spahr who is based in Minneapolis, said the firm is monitoring the situation and providing assistance to its staff and attorneys who request it.

"Some staff and attorneys have safety concerns traveling to our office or being in downtown Minneapolis," he said in an interview. "In those instances, we are letting people work modified hours and or remotely."

Ballard Spahr has provided some relief on billable hour requirements for those most affected. For certain attorneys, Michaud said, the firm is "modifying their billable hour requirement and allowing them to work from home. That is going as well as expected given the circumstances."

Michaud also said the firm set up a partnership with a local food bank where staff and attorneys can donate. "We haven't contacted the organization (to see how much has been given by Ballard staff and attorneys), but from the people who have contacted me to donate, it has been a worthwhile drive," Michaud said. "It provides some much-needed resources, and that is attorneys from Atlanta to Anchorage contributing. That is one example on top of emotional and psychological support we are trying to provide."

David Crosby, a Minneapolis-based deputy managing partner of Stinson, said the firm is providing "clear and supportive channels" with which to communicate with its employees and is also shifted the office to remote work since Jan. 16.

"Our immediate priority is supporting our people, especially our

employees in the Twin Cities, during this time," he wrote in an email. "We're focused on safety, care, and ensuring employees have access to resources and flexibility."

"Like many of our law firm colleagues, Stinson is navigating a rapidly changing landscape," Crosby added. "These changes underscore the importance of ensuring that all government activities at all levels are in full compliance with current laws. Stinson stands firm in its core values and mission to uphold the U.S. Constitution, the rule of law, legal ethics, and equal treatment and protection."

Meanwhile, Fredrikson & Byron is "actively communicating with our entire Fredrikson team and providing resources to them and their families, including offering flexible work arrangements," the firm said in a statement.

"At times like these, lawyers play a particularly important role in the administration of justice," the firm said. "As a leader in the Twin Cities legal community, we take this role seriously. We are assisting many clients and legal organizations with respect to recent ICE activities, including assistance in the context of unlawful detentions, denial of access to counsel, and other efforts to help protect the rights of our clients and support our communities."

A person familiar with Taft said the firm was "in touch with employees, closely monitoring the situation and communicating as appropriate to help ensure everyone's safety and well-being."

Not Normal

Federal officers shot and killed Good while she was driving near agents in a residential neighborhood in Minneapolis on Jan. 7. Meanwhile, on Saturday, Pretti was shot and killed after he appeared to be using his phone to record federal officers. Federal officials

say Pretti approached U.S. Border Patrol officers with a semi-automatic handgun.

The violence has stunned the city, with some residents saying they are living in fear. Local officials have complained about being shut out of investigations into the shootings.

While few firms touched on the subject of the rule of law in the wake of the shootings, some bar leaders are calling for investigations. The president of the American Bar Association said the events underline the importance of constitutional rights and holding federal officials accountable.

"This level of violence is not normal," said ABA president Michelle Behnke. "The gravity of these incidents cannot be overstated. The American Bar Association emphasizes the need for a fair and open government investigation into the shooting deaths of Alex Pretti and Renee Good, both U.S. citizens. Only through a full and proper investigation will the facts of these incidents come to light."

Other bar leaders also voiced concerns. "The Trump Administration's reactions to the killing of Renee Good and Alex Pretti in Minneapolis are undermining our rule of law," a rule of law task force from the New York County Lawyers Association said, noting the group "urgently calls for the administration to cooperate, as is customary, with the State of Minnesota in conducting a full and fair joint federal/state criminal investigation."

Shift Away From Issuing Public Statements

Business and law firm leaders were reluctant to weigh in as the bar groups did.

Dorsey's Nelson said the firm "does not make statements on political issues out of respect for the diversity of the viewpoint" of its community. How- » Page 6

Amazon Reaches \$1 Billion Settlement With Plaintiffs in Return Policy Litigation

BY KAT BLACK

AMAZON.COM Inc. has reached a settlement, which plaintiffs counsel estimates to total \$1 billion, in consumer fraud class action litigation targeting the e-commerce giant's alleged failure to adhere to its return policy and adequately refund customers for returned merchandise purchased on the Amazon platform.

Plaintiffs' counsel at Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan and the Zigler Law Group submitted a motion for preliminary approval of the settlement on Jan. 23 in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington. The case is being over-

seen by District Judge Jamal M. Whitehead.

Amazon was represented by counsel at Fenwick & West, which could not immediately be reached for comment on Monday.

The settlement class includes anyone who, starting on Sept. 5, 2017, returned an item to and/or requested a refund from Amazon and did not receive a refund, received an "untimely or incorrect refund" and/or received a refund, but was "incorrectly charged by Amazon" for the returned item.

According to the motion, Amazon is already in the process of distributing \$600 million to members of the class. The settlement also provides for a "nonreversionary common fund" for class mem-

bers worth \$309.5 million that will be used to pay "additional refunds and interest to the class, settlement expenses and fees and costs."

In addition, it said, Amazon will introduce "six multilayered steps designed to improve its return and refund practices," including "increased monitoring, an audit of potential technical issues related to refund processing, adopting automatic and manual refund processing redundancies, and improvements to customer notifications and communications."

Plaintiffs counsel valued the implementation of this new protocol at more than \$363,739,761, bringing the settlement number to \$1 billion. "We're very happy with

the outcome," said Andrew Schapiro, partner at Quinn Emanuel, in a phone interview.

"Class members should get all of their money back plus interest and, maybe most importantly, the problems that we identified in this lawsuit are going to be fixed so that other people don't have to deal with this ... difficulty and frustration."

Plaintiffs filed the initial class action complaint against Amazon, which included claims for breach of contract, breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing, conversion, promissory estoppel, money had and received, unjust enrichment and violation of Washington's Consumer Protection Act, on Sept. 5, 2023. » Page 6

Correction

In the Jan. 26 edition of the paper, an older photo of Dechert's office sign was printed in the story "Dechert Grabs 20-Lawyer Litigation Team from McDermott, Will Open New Offices in Chicago, Houston, Dallas." The updated photo is below.



COURTESY PHOTO

Expert Analysis

FAMILY LAW

Parental Rights and the NYS Legislature & Family Court Approaches

More than half a century ago, Chief Justice Warren Burger declared in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* 92 S. Ct 1526 (1972) that the “primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an enduring American tradition.” This constitutional cornerstone was reaffirmed three decades later in *Troxel v. Granville* 120 S. Ct 2054 (2000), when the Supreme Court held that parents have a fundamental right to rear their children. Yet despite these unequivocal federal mandates, New York’s statutory framework and judicial practices have failed to keep pace. Far from being “beyond debate,” the sanctity of the parent-child relationship is increasingly marginalized in New York custody proceedings, where these fundamental rights are often treated as secondary.

Anyone who has spent as much time as I have litigating in Family Court will tell you the same thing: There is a glaring double standard. New York provides parents with robust protections when the government intervenes in a family yet offers a much weaker version of those same rights in private custody battles.

Every court order that restricts a parent’s access to their child is, at its core, an act of the state—one that fundamentally disrupts the family bond. Yet, New York law treats these rights with a baffling double standard. Curiously, the law provides parents with robust protections when the government tries to intervene in the home, but those same protections vanish when the case is brought by a private individual. In New York, your right to due process shouldn’t depend on who filed the paperwork.

Article 10 Versus Article 6 of The Family Court Act

The statutory divide within the Family Court Act is stark. Article 10, which governs child protective pro-

PHILIP KATZ is a founding partner at Fink & Katz.

By Philip Katz



ceedings, is built upon comprehensive mandates for family preservation and reunification. In contrast, Article 6 - the framework for child custody and visitation—operates under a ‘pure’ best interests standard, conspicuously lacking the reunification priorities and preservation presumptions that define child protective litigation. New York State’s child protective statutes are designed to, *inter alia*, “provide a due process of law for determining when the state, through its family court, may intervene against the wishes of a parent...” *FCA §1011*

Every court order that restricts a parent’s access to their child is, at its core, an act of the state—one that fundamentally disrupts the family bond.

Article 10: The Presumption Of Preservation

In recent decades, Article 10 jurisprudence has evolved to rigorously defend the parent-child bond. The Court of Appeals has made clear that the “reasonable efforts” requirement creates a presumptive obligation toward family preservation. *Matter of Marino S.*, 100 N.Y.2d 361 (2003). This was echoed in *Nicholson v. Scoppetta*, 3 N.Y.3d 357 (2004), where the Court anchored the return of children to their parents in fundamental constitutional principles, requiring a specific showing of “imminent danger” to justify removal.

The statutory framework supports this through *FCA §§1027 and 1028*, which provide for expedited hearings—a right that applies even when the child remains in the home but a parent has been excluded by

an order of protection. *Matter of Elizabeth C.*, 156 A.D.4d 193 (2d Dept. 2017). The judiciary has recently signaled its intolerance for procedural delays in these matters; in *Matter of Emmanuel C.F.*, 230 N.Y.S.3d 12 (1st Dept. 2024), the First Department held that piecemeal adjournments in § 1028 cases constitute an abuse of discretion, reaffirming the statutory mandate for swift adjudication when parental access is at stake.

The Article 6 Vacuum: Discretion Without Guardrails

The Family Court’s jurisdiction over custody and visitation is rooted in Family Court Act §651, which grants broad authority to determine the “custody or visitation of minors.” In exercising this power, jurists possess substantial discretion to issue temporary orders. Under *FCA §651 and Domestic Relations Law §240*, the court may issue interim orders as “justice requires,” guided by the circumstances of the parties and the “best interests of the child.” *DRL §240(1)(a)(4)*. To act, a jurist need only possess “adequate relevant information to enable it to make an informed and provident temporary custody determination.” *Matter of Melikishvili v. Grigolava*, 20 A.D.3d 569, 570 (2d Dept. 2005).

Critically, Article 6 lacks any provision comparable to the expedited hearing mandates of *FCA §§1027 and 1028*. There is no statutory mechanism under Article 6 for a parent to demand an immediate evidentiary hearing when their parental rights are curtailed by an “interim” or “temporary” order.

This procedural void creates a predictable and devastating pattern. Relying on these unvetted allegations—and often bolstered by an Attorney for the Child—the court may determine—it has “adequate information” to limit the respondent’s access to their child. At this early juncture, the petitioner’s motivations and the veracity of the claims cannot be fully tested through cross-examination or discovery.

The result is the swift issuance of a temporary order “in the best interests of the child” » Page 7

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

BERNARD D’ORAZIO
& ASSOCIATES, P.C.
NEW YORK CITY

DORAZIO-LAW.COM

JUDGMENT ENFORCEMENT & DEBT COLLECTION LITIGATION

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AI and Evidence in NY Law: The Disappearing Original Fact

There are times in the development of the law when the foundational assumptions that underlie our adjudicatory structure must be reconsidered. This is one of those times. The accelerating spread of artificial intelligence, specifically, AI systems capable of generating audio, video, text, and images that are indistinguishable from real-world recordings, has created a crisis for the law of evidence.

For centuries, courts have operated on a shared premise: that evidence admitted at trial is tethered to something that actually occurred. A trial has been the search for what happened. The courtroom has been the place where competing accounts confront a common reality.

We are now approaching a point where that premise cannot be assumed. The danger is not merely falsification. Evidence that has been forged, altered, or manipulated can still be contested, investigated, and disproven because it has a relationship to the real. What artificial intelligence now enables is the creation of evidence that looks real, behaves as if real, and has the persuasive force of real, but has no original. Synthetic evidence is not counterfeit reality. It is a parallel to reality without origin. This development threatens to shift the role of the trial from determining the truth of past events to selecting between narratives with equal persuasive force, none of which can be verified by ordinary means. If courts cannot distinguish what happened from what only appears to have happened, the institution of adjudication itself is destabilized.

This article examines that problem in three domains: civil litigation, criminal prosecution, and the doctrinal assumptions of authentication under New York law. It does not argue for panic, prohibition, or technological rejection. Instead, it argues for clarity: the law must confront the fact that the evidentiary system presumes a world in

RONALD CASTORINA, JR. serves on the Supreme Court in the Thirteenth Judicial District.

By Ronald Castorina, Jr.



which truth is knowable, events are observable, and the “real” can be distinguished from the representational. We are entering a world where those presumptions are no longer guaranteed.

I. Authentication and the Assumption of the Real Event

New York law requires that evidence be authenticated by showing that it “is what its proponent claims it to be,” a principle reaffirmed in *People v. McGee*, (49 NY2d 48 [1979]). In *Zegarelli v. Hughes*, (3 NY3d 64 [2004]), the Court of

But generative AI removes step one. It allows creation of records that appear to document events that never happened.

Appeals held that digital communications can be authenticated by circumstantial evidence of authorship, reaffirming that credibility, consistency, and inferred context may suffice even absent technological verification. And in *People v. Brown*, (13 NY3d 332 [2009]), the Court of Appeals held that electronically generated records may be admitted where the proponent establishes the reliability of the system that produced them, even if no human actor directly observed or authored the information. The foundation for such evidence therefore rests not on eyewitness confirmation, but on demonstrating that the digital recordkeeping process operates as a trustworthy and accurate method of retaining information.

Each of these rules assumes something that is no longer guaranteed: that the evidence refers to a real event.

Authentication doctrine has always presupposed that:

- An event occurred in the world.
- A record was made of that event.
- The record can be traced back to the event.

But generative AI removes step one. It allows creation of records that appear to document events that never happened. Traditional evidentiary safeguards, therefore, may be pointed at the wrong target. They authenticate consistency, metadata, recordkeeping integrity, and witness familiarity. Yet synthetic evidence can satisfy all these criteria while remaining entirely unreal.

The challenge is not proving authenticity. The challenge is defining authenticity in a world where representation may precede event.

II. Civil Litigation: The Sincere Witness and The Synthetic Record

Civil litigation is already experiencing a wave of disputes where parties are not attempting deception yet the evidence, they rely upon is partially or wholly machine generated. The following hypotheticals are illustrative of some real-world issue litigants and jurists may be confronting in real time. This is not a future problem; this is actually unfolding in courtrooms all over the state at the time of the writing of this article.

A. Matrimonial Litigation And Synthetic Memory

Consider a divorce action involving equitable distribution. One spouse produces text messages that appear to show the other acknowledging undisclosed cryptocurrency assets. The receiving spouse testifies honestly that the conversation “felt” real. The tone matches prior exchanges. Nothing in the record suggests deceit.

However, forensic analysis reveals that during cloud backup, the messaging app reconstructed missing segments using predictive language model- » Page 7

Looking for an accomplished expert?

ALM Experts has leaders in every discipline.

ONE ultimate resource includes:

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

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

Your source for experts, consultants & litigation support services.

Off the Front

Budget

« Continued from page 1

and the Legislature again this year to ensure that the judiciary continues to have the resources it needs to provide New Yorkers with a fair, efficient and innovative court system that emphasizes the courts' expanding role as a vehicle for resolving some of the most pressing problems faced by our communities."

The additional funding requested by the judiciary will be directed to help ensure that low-income New Yorkers have adequate access to justice, and to assist families and court-involved individuals struggling with mental health, the budget message said.

The fiscal 2027 budget includes funding to create new parts in 350 problem-solving courts, to improve public safety, reduce recidivism and provide better outcomes for participants, the budget states.

The budget also seeks to complement the Hochul administration's "Your Family is My Fight" initiatives. The policy drive, summed up in the slogan, reflects the commitment by Hochul, a Democrat, to supporting working families, strengthening the economy, and protecting residents.

Assembly Judiciary Chairman Charles Lavine, D-North Shore, told the Law Journal on Tuesday: "The Office of Court Administration budget proposal includes funding for additional personnel and \$179.5 million for civil legal

services. It includes as well \$60 million for capital improvements. The proposal is reasonable and judicious."

The \$179.5 million request for civil legal services represents a proposed increase of \$25 million, which would be geared toward supporting recruitment and retention for providers and expanding access to legal services in the most critical areas, the budget request read.

Yet, the proposed increase is but a fraction of what the state needs for civil legal services, representing less than 20% of the total annual amount necessary to fully address it, the budget report said, citing a recent study by the Permanent Commission on Access to Justice.

"At a time of stark distress for economically disadvantaged New Yorkers, increased funding for access to legal representation in matters that jeopardize their basic needs, such as housing and food, is a priority for judicial leadership," the budget message read.

Meanwhile, the requested capital appropriation would reflect a \$10 million increase from this year, which the judiciary says is necessary to address continued demands for technology infrastructure and products, as well as public safety measures, including secure access, screening and emergency preparedness.

The judiciary's technology infrastructure budget would jump to \$128 million, an increase of \$23 million, for ongoing enhancements.

They include a virtual court appearance platform, full implementation of the Clean Slate Act that seals millions of eligible convictions by November 2027, exploration of the use of generative artificial intelligence to improve access to justice through use of virtual assistants, an online E-plea system platform that allows courts to adjudicate traffic infractions entirely online, and continual upgrades to audio systems, video conferencing, evidence presentation and assistive listening device systems in courtrooms.

Court officials say they are also expanding help centers for unrepresented litigants in New York City Housing Court in fiscal 2027.

Technically, the court system's requested all funds budget approaches \$4.5 billion, because as a separate branch of government, it is the only state agency required to include its \$1.2 billion costs for employee and retiree fringe benefits.

These non-discretionary obligations for the judiciary's retirement costs are increasing \$149.2 million, or 14.3% over the current year appropriation. The hike is not unique to the judiciary, and is the result of significant increases in costs for pensions, social security, Medicare, and health, dental, vision and life insurance benefits, the budget message read.

Zayas is visiting Albany to present his budget request on Feb. 12.

© Brian Lee can be reached at brian.lee@alm.com.

Leases

« Continued from page 1

Avenue. Meanwhile, Goodwin added 32,687 square feet at its new office on Fifth Avenue.

A representative for Kirkland did not respond to requests for comment on the additional space.

A representative for Goodwin said that the firm will move into its new office at 200 Fifth Avenue in Q1 2027 and that the expansion is in line with increased client demand and a long-term commitment to New York.

A representative for McGuire-Woods said in an email to Law.com that the firm's new lease maintained its existing presence at 1251 Avenue of the Americas on the 20th floor and expanded up into the 21st. That expansion added 74,708 square feet, according to the Cresa data.

Gregg Cohen, Cresa's principal, said the continuing leasing theme has been that Big Law is expanding out of its current offices and may now be grabbing even more space than firms immediately need as a "proactive" measure.

Cohen said that part of that decision may have been driven by a need to grab additional square footage while it is still available rather than miss out later.

Kirkland now has around 180,000 square feet total at 900 Third Avenue, or roughly 30% of the building, Cohen said.

"If you're at 601 Lexington, in this case, you probably need to grab space while you can before there's no more space to grab in that area, right?" Cohen said. "It's not like there's a ton of buildings that have large floor plates. That's probably driving it a little bit as well—that continued space race."

For their part, Gibson Dunn and Baker Hostetler retained their existing offices at 200 Park Avenue and 630 Fifth Avenue. Gibson Dunn has about 361,569 square feet, and Baker Hostetler occupies about 115,000 square feet, according to the Cresa data.

While some firms are still actively seeking out more space in Manhattan, the Q4 data for 2025 highlighted a 21.3% drop in total square footage leased year-over-year to Q4 2024. Cohen said that dip is not an indication of a downward slope in the market and is more likely a function of "office lease roll." The Cresa data figures also show that Q4 2025 saw 115% as much square footage leased as in Q3 2025.

Similar data figures provided to Law.com by commercial real estate firm Cushman & Wakefield showed a dip in total law firm leasing as compared to Q4 2024. However, the broader figures indicate that the legal market is taking a large portion of New York's total office market.

According to the Cushman data, in Q4 2025, law firms leased 587,489 square feet of the approximate 10.2 million total square feet

leased in Manhattan during that time, or 5.8% of the borough's office leases. That is down year-over-year as compared to Q4 2024, when Cushman data showed law firms took 13.6% by leasing about 1.3 million of the leased square feet in Manhattan. Yet both sets of figures show significant new or renewed leases for law firms in the city.

Mark Weiss, executive vice chair at Cushman, said in an email to Law.com that many major firms are committing to New York because of the ability to collaborate with one another.

"Law firms, especially the high-quality firms, are leading the market in growth in large measure because they all came to the realization, at about the same time, that when they are physically together, they are far more productive and creative," Weiss said. "Their recent growth reflects this sudden reversal in their attitudes towards the workplace."

Indeed, more law firms are moving to require their lawyers spend at least four days in the office. In recent months, firms including Goodwin Procter, Cooley and Dechert have all made four-day office attendance news. Close to 20 Am Law 50 firms now require four or more days of weekly attendance for some or all of their employees, Law.com has reported.

© Ryan Harroff can be reached at ryan.harroff@alm.com.

ners really just killed it this year, they worked really hard, across the platform," he said. "I'm very proud of how everybody came together and collaborated to further institutionalize our client relationships."

Among the work handled by equity partners was a standout case for Sheppard Mullin—the "real life 'Succession'" case of Rupert Murdoch and his son Lachlan Murdoch versus the rest of the clan in a dispute over which of Murdoch's children would have sole authority over the family trust after Rupert's passing.

Sheppard Mullin partner Adam Streisand—who has represented Britney Spears, Los Angeles Clippers owner Steve Ballmer and the estates of Michael Jackson, Ray Charles and William Randolph Hearst, to name a few—was the lead partner representing Rupert Murdoch in the trust battle. On the other side of the courtroom, Sullivan & Cromwell represented Murdoch trustee Cruden Financial Services, and Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom represented Murdoch siblings.

"Following all that protracted litigation, the result was a historic \$3.3 billion settlement, and the resolution is really a beautiful example of innovative approaches to family warfare," Salvi quipped. "It reinforced our reputation at Sheppard Mullin for succession planning, private wealth and complex family business disputes."

The firm also represented Village Roadshow Entertainment Group, the studio behind film franchises including "Ocean's Eleven," "The Matrix" and "Mad Max," in its Chapter 11 bank-

ruptcy proceedings in California last November. As lead counsel, Sheppard Mullin secured a \$12.7 million debtors-in-possession loan from pre-petition lenders and a \$417.5 million bid by Alcon Media Group for the company's film library to help it pay creditors. The firm also warded off challenges from Warner Bros. Entertainment, which lost a bid for the library rights and subsequently (and unsuccessfully) sought to challenge the sale of the assets.

Sheppard Mullin has ample projects to carry it through future years, including for the 2028 Olympic Games. The firm has been contracted by event organizers LA28 to handle venue arrangements, among other matters, Salvi said. One of the firm's lawyers represents the University of Southern California, which will play host to several competitions and offer part of its campus to the Games, including badminton and track and field.

"We are incredibly proud to be tapped and working for such a prestigious matter and engagement as the Olympics," Salvi said. "Part of the value add for our clients is we have a track record of success working on matters like this," he added.

© Samson Amore can be reached at samson.amore@alm.com.

DECISIONS WANTED!

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

Outside Counsel

Second Circuit Reshapes Cross-Border Discovery Under Section 1782

Parties in foreign or international proceedings increasingly rely on Section 1782 of Title 28 of the U.S. Code ("Section 1782") to obtain U.S.-style discovery—which typically is broader and more permissive than in many foreign jurisdictions—for use abroad. The statute enables foreign litigants to access critical evidence located in the United States, including documents from financial institutions, digital service providers, insurance carriers and other third parties, potentially influencing the outcome of overseas cases. According to one study, Section 1782 applications surged by 300% between 2014 and 2024.

Historically, courts often required applicants to share Section 1782 materials with their foreign adversaries, as would be required in U.S. domestic litigation. However, in *Bourlakov v. Kazakov*, No. 24-3187-cv, 25-49-cv (2d Cir. 2025), the Second Circuit held for the first time that there is no *per se* rule requiring such disclosure—a decision expected to have significant impact on litigants' future use of Section 1782.

Section 1782 Overview

Section 1782 permits an "interested party" in a foreign proceeding to seek discovery from a person or entity located in the United States. Both the Supreme Court and Second Circuit interpret the statute broadly, and applications are routinely granted unless they conflict with policy or undermine the statute's purpose. Key terms have been given expansive meanings: a "foreign proceeding," for instance, can be civil, criminal, or administrative—even a matter that is "reasonably contemplated" qualifies, not only those that already are pending. The definition of "foreign proceeding" is not without limits,

SCOTT SCHIRICK is a partner at Alston & Bird. ALAN MENDELSON is a senior associate at the firm. JENNA JONES, a senior associate, and ERICA CAGLIERO, an associate at the firm, assisted in the preparation of this article.



By Scott Schirick



And Alan Mendelson

however. For instance, the Supreme Court held in *ZF Automotive US, Inc. v. Luxshare, Ltd.*, 596 U.S. 619, 633 (2022), that private international arbitrations are not "foreign or international tribunals" within Section 1782's meaning.

The breadth of Section 1782 is illustrated by a 2020 case in which the Southern District of New York granted the Nigerian government's

The Second Circuit held for the first time that there is no *per se* rule requiring Section 1782 applicants to share subpoenaed materials with their foreign adversaries.

Section 1782 application seeking discovery from JPMorgan Chase Bank for use in existing criminal proceedings there, as well as for use in a confidential criminal investigation being conducted by Nigeria's Economic and Financial Crimes Commission.

Discovery under Section 1782 follows Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b), giving district courts broad discretion to shape discovery orders. Subpoenas—whether for documents or testimony—carry the full force of U.S. civil discovery rules, making Section 1782 a powerful tool for foreign litigants.

Benefits of Section 1782 Discovery for Foreign Litigants

Many foreign jurisdictions authorize more limited discovery than in the United States, relying on narrower court-managed proce-

dures or requiring disclosure late in the lifecycle of a case. Section 1782 allows foreign litigants to avail themselves of more expansive U.S. discovery procedures to obtain documents and information to which they might not otherwise have had access early in a case, provided the applicant does not seek discovery prohibited in the foreign jurisdiction.

England and Bermuda provide instructive examples. In England, prior to 2019, discovery (or "disclosure," as it is known) occurred only in the lead up to trial. Even after 2019 reforms moved-up the disclosure timeline, its parameters remain narrow—documents must be known, individually identifiable, and intended to be admitted at trial.

A Section 1782 applicant, by contrast, need not know what specific documents exist, much less establish in advance their discoverability or admissibility. In Bermuda, discovery requires parties to mutually exchange document lists within fourteen days of the close of pleadings, and only documents in the possession of a party are discoverable. By contrast, Section 1782 permits subpoenas to non-parties and applies even to reasonably contemplated proceedings.

'In Re: Application of Loudmila Bourlakov'

Despite Section 1782's many advantages for foreign litigants, U.S. courts often reflexively required Section 1782 applicants to share subpoenaed materials with foreign adversaries, consistent with domestic practice. District courts in the Second Circuit took somewhat varying approaches to the question; however, most required successful Section 1782 applicants to share the subpoenaed materials with "interested parties," citing the Advisory Committee Notes to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, which state that "[t]he party serving the subpoena should... make reasonable provision for prompt access [to a party desiring access to information produced in response to the subpoena]."

In *Bourlakov*, the district court declined to follow this » Page 6

IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

Goldin also conceded the false citations involved AI and accepted responsibility for his signature on the filing.

This week, Kearney concluded that both attorneys violated Rule 11 by signing and filing a briefing with false citations without confirming the accuracy of the legal authority presented.

The court noted non-monetary sanctions were necessary because Goldin erred in material respects, including "his near-blind acceptance of papers drafted by an attorney not admitted to the bar of this court and his filing of those papers under his own name without checking the cited legal authority." However, it noted that Goldin has participated in various remedial ventures, including voluntarily completing a continuing legal education course on the ethical and responsible use of AI, as well as reading recent opinions in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit on the topic. Goldin also claimed that he and Anderson and Associates have agreed that all future filings will be submitted to him at least 48 hours before the filing deadline to allow for a more thorough review.

Regarding Anderson, the court determined a small monetary sanction of \$4,000, and non-monetary sanctions were appropriate given her conduct extended "beyond what a purely non-monetary sanction would adequately address."

The court noted that Anderson failed to double-check the brief and the cases mentioned before filing, and that she failed to review the motion for additional errors or question the law clerk about their research for the motion, even after opposing counsel identified a false quotation the same day Anderson and Associates staff discovered the law clerk had used AI without disclosure in two unrelated cases. Rather, Anderson filed a reply brief a week later that contained multiple false citations, which the court later identified.

"I respect the court's ruling and take my professional responsibilities very seriously. The court recognized that I acted promptly once the issue came to light and that I took concrete steps to ensure that this does

not happen again. I appreciate the court's measured approach and the opportunity to contribute to broader education and training on the responsible use of technology in the legal practice," Goldin said in an emailed comment.

"I do appreciate the federal judiciary's thoughtful attempt at dealing with the artificial intelligence wave that is sweeping across the legal industry," said Anderson in an emailed comment. "But I am deeply saddened, disappointed, and discouraged by the decision that essentially scapegoats me over my former law clerk's unauthorized and unreported artificial intelligence usage."

Howard N. Shipley of Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, in Alexandria, Virginia, represented Lifetime Well and did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

—Riley Brennan

Hogan Lovells Funds Partner Joins Norton Rose Fulbright

Fund formation partner Richard Madris is joining Norton Rose Fulbright in New York from Hogan Lovells.

Madris previously joined Hogan Lovells in November 2023 from the now-dissolved Stroock Stroock & Lavan, where he had served as head of the defunct firm's infrastructure funds practice.

"I'm really excited to join Norton Rose Fulbright as a partner in the funds and asset management practice in New York. It's really an excellent fit with a strong practice in funds and asset management in the United States and globally," Madris said in an interview, adding that his clients are joining him in the move. "My practice will benefit from synergies with the firm's practices in infrastructure and energy, real estate, private credit and other asset classes."

According to both Madris and Norton Rose US head of financial services Andrew Lom, it's an interesting time to be in the funds space. Clients are clamoring for services, seeking assistance in creating new products and expressing interest in what Lom called the "democratization of funds," or private equity gaining access to 401K funds.

"We're trying to grow our funds practice. We have been growing it over the last couple of years, and we're particularly excited to do that in areas where we have strong synergies with other groups," Lom said. "It could be in project finance, energy, areas where we can help the fund clients do their fund work and their deal work. Distressed assets and real estate are a couple areas in there that Richard covers, and we're really happy to get him onto our platform."

Madris, meanwhile, noted strong demand in areas such as accessing private funds through private wealth channels, fund financing, and private credit focusing on real assets, as well as the innovation of new products.

"One of the things that I'm particularly well-known for is creating the JP Morgan infrastructure investment fund, a global open-ended infrastructure fund, that was really the first of its kind in the United States," Madris said. "There's always been demand for new products and innovative products. As the marketplace changes and adapts, the key is to be able to deliver those products to clients in a manner that is accessible to them ... That's something that I have focused on for really my entire career."

Madris's move comes roughly one month after Hogan Lovells announced an upcoming merger with Cadwalader Wickersham & Taft. Most recently, King & Spalding and Paul Hastings have claimed their share of funds finance talent from Cadwalader, with Paul Hastings launching a new Charlotte office with the help of attorneys from Cadwalader, led by Danyele Chung, and attorneys from Haynes and Boone, including partner Holly Loftis.

Hogan Lovells did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

—Amanda O'Brien

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

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

Sheppard

« Continued from page 1

last year substantially," said Luca Salvi, Sheppard Mullin's executive committee chair. 2025, Salvi said, "was a great year for us and I'm cautiously optimistic and bullish about 2026 as we continue to build on that strength."

Sheppard Mullin said it hasn't yet finalized its 2025 profits per equity partner, but Salvi said "our PEP surged well into the double-digits, and that was really due to the strong demand and collaboration across our practice groups and industry teams."

The firm's revenue per lawyer was \$1.34 million, up roughly 6.5% from \$1.26 million the year prior.

Headcount growth at Sheppard Mullin in 2025 grew 6.8% year-over-year: The firm's total lawyer count was 1,020 attorneys in 2025, compared to 964 the year prior.

Sheppard Mullin's "gold standard" of "focused, incremental, strategic growth" was again the focus in the past fiscal year and the firm didn't experience any shrinkage of its equity ranks in 2025, Salvi said. "We add a certain number of equity partners internally, but it wasn't an extraordinary difference," he said. "We continue to advance equity partners from our internal ranks," Salvi said, noting the firm added 30 partners in the last year and "a number of those were equity partners."

"Honestly, it was that increased demand and collaboration" that boosted Sheppard Mullin's bottom line again this past year, Salvi said. "Our equity part-

Real Estate Trends

REALTY LAW DIGEST

By
Scott E.
Mollen



Expansion of Religious Facility—Village Law Which Treated Religious Development Less Favorably Than Comparable Secular Land Uses Was Facially Invalid Under the US Constitution—Under the Village’s Zoning Code, “A Pit of Manure May Be Located Closer to the Property Line Than a Place of Worship”—a Former Mayor Described Village Use “Law as a Negotiating Weapon Wielded Against Religious Groups”—Court Found That “Disgracefully,” the Village Ignored the Recommendations of Its Zoning Consultant With Respect to “Building Height to Gain Leverage in Negotiations With Religious Organizations”

The plaintiffs sought to build a “Chabad” on land located in the subject village. They own more than 9 acres in the village. They alleged that the village obstructed their effort “chiefly through the adoption of a land use statute aimed at places of worship.”

The subject case “is rapidly approaching its second decade of pendency” and was the “oldest matter” on the court’s docket. Following discovery, the defendants moved for summary judgment with respect to all claims. The plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment.

The court stated that “[m]uch of the motion practice blithely ignores the relevant, if not dispositive, litigative history of this action, eliding determinations made by this Court.” A prior federal court (NY) had rendered a decision involving the subject property which “proved dispositive of many of the issues raised at that time” period.

The court found that the plaintiffs’ motion for partial summary judgment on its facial challenge to the “Village’s POW (Places of Worship Law) as a deprivation of their right to the Free Exercise of religion...proves the only meritorious motion now before the Court.” The court noted that prior determinations resolved “many of the issues raised here.” For example, a prior decision that the plaintiffs had “adequately alleged a facial challenge to the POW Law.”

In 2024, the subject court found that “compared to the religious uses specified in the POW Law, ‘the Village imposes less onerous requisites on landowners who opt to develop land for residential purposes’ and ‘provides far more generous provisions for many types of non-residential,

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

ZONING AND LAND USE PLANNING

Court Reaffirms SEQRA Standing for Property Owners

By
John C.
Armentano



New York’s State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) plays a key role in its municipalities’ decision-making. Designed to ensure that environmental considerations are meaningfully incorporated into governmental actions, SEQRA requires state and local governmental agencies, including municipalities, to assess the potential environmental impacts of (i.e., take the required “hard look” at) proposed activities before taking any action.

As a threshold matter, standing to challenge governmental action under SEQRA has long been a point of contention. While SEQRA reflects the New York State Legislature’s commitment to environmental conservation, not every party opposed to a governmental action may challenge an agency determination in court. Standing to sue under SEQRA requires that the petitioner establish an “injury-in-fact” that falls within the “zone of interest” that the statute protects. This is accomplished by demonstrating that it will suffer an injury that is environmental and not solely economic in nature.

Over time, New York courts have refined this doctrine, such that affected property owners whose property is “the very subject” of the government action need not specify allegations of environmental harm, thus distinguishing between different categories of challengers and their standing requirements.

In *In the Matter of Seneca Meadows, Inc. v. Town of Seneca Falls, et al.*, 2025 NY Slip Op 06961, the New

York Court of Appeals recently revisited these standing principles in the context of a local law enacted by Seneca Falls prohibiting solid waste disposal facilities from operating within its borders. The court held that when a property owner challenges SEQRA compliance in connection with a governmental action targeting their land, a court’s analysis of their standing to lodge that challenge differs from the one applicable to neighboring or nearby landowners.

In doing so, the court reaffirmed established precedent while underscoring the continued importance of SEQRA’s “hard look” requirement.

A SEQRA Primer

SEQRA is codified in Article 8 of New York’s Environmental Conservation Law and is intended, per the statute’s own language, to “promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and enhance human and community resources” by making environmental considerations a requirement in certain governmental decision-making. Rather than prescribing substantive outcomes, SEQRA imposes procedural and statutory obligations on state and local agencies to ensure that environmental factors are considered alongside social and economic concerns before deciding to approve an action.

At the heart of SEQRA compliance is the requisite “hard look” to evaluate the consequences of a proposed action. Under the implementing regulations, including 6 NYCRR § 617.7, the lead agency in contemplating the significance of a Type 1 or Unlisted action must: thoroughly analyze the identified relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and set forth its determination of signifi-

cance in a written form containing a reasoned elaboration and providing reference to any supporting documentation. A review of a potential action without such analysis will not withstand judicial scrutiny.

SEQRA Standing in Practice

As with other statutory causes of action, standing to sue under SEQRA requires a petitioner to establish an injury-in-fact that falls within the zone of interests the statute is designed to protect. Ordinarily, this means showing that the challenged governmental action will cause an environmental injury distinct from purely economic harm.

Courts have repeatedly emphasized that most plaintiffs must allege more than generalized grievances or financial impacts to secure standing under SEQRA. *Soc’y of Plastics Indus., Inc. v. Cnty. of Suffolk*, 77 N.Y.2d 761, 772, 1991).

Over time, the Court of Appeals has recognized an important qualification to that general rule. In *Har*

sity of demonstrating the likelihood of resultant environmental harm.” Even if the owner could not show an adverse environmental effect at the time they brought suit, they “nevertheless have a legally cognizable interest in being assured that the decision makers, before proceeding, have considered all of the potential environmental consequences, taken the required ‘hard look,’ and made the necessary ‘reasoned elaboration’ of the basis for their determination.”

The Court of Appeals reaffirmed and expanded upon that principle in *Matter of Gernatt Asphalt Prods. v. Town of Sardinia*, 87 N.Y.2d 668 (N.Y. 1996), where a zoning amendment eliminated a landowner’s ability to conduct mining operations on its property. Once again, the court concluded that an affected property owner had standing to assert a SEQRA challenge based solely on their status as the owner of property directly regulated by a governmental action. In such circumstances, the owner’s interest in meaningful SEQRA compliance suffices to sat-

The Court of Appeals’ decision in “Seneca Meadows” reinforces the principle that standing to challenge SEQRA compliance is not uniform for all challengers.

Enters. v. Town of Brookhaven, 74 N.Y.2d 524 (N.Y. 1989), the court addressed a rezoning that targeted a petitioner’s property. It held that in such a circumstance, the property owner need not allege a specific “environmental harm” to challenge the sufficiency of the agency’s SEQRA review.

The court’s reasoning in *Har* results in the obvious. A property owner’s interest in their project could be “so substantial and its connection to it so direct or intimate as to give it standing without the neces-

isfy the statute’s zone-of-interests requirement, even without allegations of environmental harm distinct from the regulation itself.

Lower courts have applied these principles when evaluating SEQRA standing, particularly where legislative actions such as zoning amendments or local laws restrict the use of identified parcels. Courts have distinguished challenges brought by property owners from challenges brought by nearby or neighboring property owners, who must show a concrete environmental

Leader of Beverly Hills Boutique Exits to Join Data Center Developer On Growth Tear

BY MICHAEL GENNARO

CRUSOE Energy Systems, which bills itself as the first vertically integrated AI infrastructure provider, has hired Nader Pakfar, the managing partner of a boutique Beverly Hills law firm for the past 15 years, to serve as general counsel of real estate.

The appointment of Nader Pakfar comes as Denver-based Crusoe ramps up its hyperscale data center development ambitions. Hyperscale data center development entails building massive facilities with innovative designs for power, cooling and networking to handle enormous data demands.

Though founded just eight years ago, Crusoe was valued at \$10 billion when it raised \$1.4 billion in a funding round in October. It has carved out a niche by co-locating data centers with stranded energy sources, including natural gas flaring sites and renewable energy installations.

To take the role, Pakfar is departing Sutton, Pakfar & Courtney, a boutique law firm specializing in complex real estate transactions that he cofounded in 2011.

The firm has advised institutional investors, developers and operators on deals collectively valued at more than \$10 billion.

The firm has built a reputation for handling sophisticated joint ventures, development agreements and real estate finance matters for clients navigating large-scale commercial projects.

Before SPC, Pakfar practiced corporate and real estate law at a succession of law firms and spent 18 months as an Afghanistan-based project coordinator for UNOPS, a nonprofit that helps develop sustainable infrastructure around the world.

In announcing Pakfar’s departure from SPC, James Courtney, a founding partner of SPC, said, “Nader’s vision and dedication have been central to SPC LLP’s success. From his instrumental role in building this firm to his unwavering commitment to clients and colleagues, Nader has set a standard of excellence that will resonate for years to come.”

At Crusoe, Pakfar will concentrate on the company’s global real estate legal strategy, working to navigate the regulatory, zoning, financing and contractual complexities inherent in hyperscale data center development.

“As we continue to grow our global AI infrastructure footprint, Nader’s ability to navigate complex real estate, financing, and risk-

» Page 7

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

California Appellate Court Sides With Plaintiffs in Key Consumer Standing Case

BY CHERYL MILLER

TENANTS can sue for violations of California’s background check law even if they did not suffer any actual injuries, a Los Angeles appellate court held Wednesday in a case with broader implications for plaintiffs standing issues in the Golden State.

A unanimous Second District Court of Appeal panel found in a published opinion that residents of a Southern California apartment complex can bring claims against their landlord for violations of the state’s Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act for failing to provide required information about screen applications they completed as prospective renters.

The defendants argued that the three plaintiffs cannot seek statutory damages of at least \$10,000, because the apartment complex approved them as tenants and they suffered no harm. But the three-justice panel said a plain reading of the law does not require plaintiffs to show they were injured by a violation.

“As we explain, we conclude that the \$10,000 amount operates as an alternative to actual damages and provides standing for plaintiffs to pursue their claims,” wrote Presiding Justice Lee Smalley Edmon of the Second District’s Division Three. “Whether characterized as statutory damages or a statutory penalty, the \$10,000 minimum recovery for an ICRAA violation is punitive and untethered to actual injury.”

Edmon was joined in the *Yeh v. Barrington Pacific* opinion by Associate Justices Anne Hegerton and Mark Hansono.

A coalition of consumer groups submitted an amicus brief on behalf of the tenant-plaintiffs and hailed the court’s ruling.

“This decision preserves a core principle of California law: When the Legislature grants consumers enforceable rights, courts do not get to erase them by importing federal standing barriers that do not apply here,” William Pletcher, litigation director at Consumer Watchdog, said in a prepared statement.

A litigation team from Hinshaw & Culberston defended the apartment complex owner, Barrington Pacific. Partner Justin Penn and Sara Franks did not immediately respond to a message seeking comment.

The Apartment Owners Association of California, represented by attorneys from Procopio, submitted an amicus brief on behalf of the defendants and warned in a statement this month that an adverse ruling could expose property owners to “massive lawsuits over harmless paperwork issues.”

California’s Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act requires landlords and employers conducting background checks to, among other things, notify applicants, obtain their authorization and provide them a copy of the resulting report upon request.

Yeh was decided as California and federal courts appear to be moving in different direc-

» Page 7

New York Law Journal

Serving the Bench and Bar Since 1888



Official Publication for the First
And Second Judicial Departments

220 E. 42nd Street, 21st Floor, New York, N.Y. 10017

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

LAW.COM

The New York Law Journal
(ISSN 0028-7326) (USPS 383020)
is published daily except Saturdays, Sundays
and legal holidays by LAW.COM,
220 E. 42nd Street, 21st Floor,
New York, N.Y. 10017. Periodicals postage paid at
New York, N.Y. and at additional mailing offices.

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

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

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

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

Postmaster: Send address changes to the
New York Law Journal, 220 E. 42nd Street, 21st
Floor, New York, N.Y. 10017. Available on micro-
film and microfiche. Rates on request.

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

Alexander

« Continued from page 1

lure targets to parties and vacation homes where women were plied with drugs, given spiked drinks and raped, sometimes using “brute force.”

They allege the scheme ran between 2008 and 2021. As many as 20 women could be called to testify, some under pseudonyms, per court records.

In her opening statements, assistant U.S. attorney Madison Smyser said the brothers attacked women together, sometimes in the same room at the same time, and then “celebrated” the rapes in messages to one another. “They had a playbook,” she told the jury.

A lawyer for Tal Alexander said that, as the older brother of twins, her client was often “lumped in” with his siblings. Prosecutors, she said, were counting on this phenomenon.

“You will hear no testimony that Tal ever acted unlawfully because it never happened,” said Deanna Paul of Walden Macht Haran & Williams.

“The government’s broad narrative cannot substitute a crime,” she added.

Both Geragos and Paul warned jurors the evidence in the case may make them uncomfortable, including videos of alleged assaults and messages exchanged between the brothers that were demeaning to women. They instructed the panel to put aside emotional or moral reactions and focus on the testimony.

And while prosecutors allege some of the assaults were facilitated by drugging, defense counsel said there are no toxicology reports supporting any of those allegations.

There may be messages between the brothers to secure drugs for their recreational use, but there are no messages in which they conspire to drug would-be victims, Paul said.

Geragos called the claims of drugging “ultimate absolution,” by the victims of any shame they may feel about the sexual encounters or other choices they made. Civil litigation preceded the criminal case, giving witnesses the motive to lie, she said.

Defense counsel for Alon Alexander, Howard Srebnick, did not deliver openings on Tuesday, instead saying he planned to do so at the beginning of the defense case.

Witness testimony began on Tuesday and the trial is expected to last a month.

An Alexander brothers spokesperson said his clients “categorically deny that anyone was drugged, assaulted or coerced, and the government has presented no physical evidence, medical records, contemporaneous complaints or objective proof to establish those claims.”

Alon Alexander is represented by Florida-based attorneys Howard M. Srebnick and Jacqueline Perczek of Black Srebnick. Oren Alexander is represented by Marc Agnifilo, Teny Geragos and Zach Ingrater of Agnifilo Intrater and Florida-based lawyers Jenny Wilson and Richard Klugh of Klugh Wilson. Tal Alexander is represented by Milton Williams, Deanna Paul, Alexander Kahn of Walden Macht Haran & Williams.

© Emily Saul can be reached at emily.saul@alm.com.

Morrison

« Continued from page 1

With \$127.8 million in revenue, Morrison Cohen is a contender for the Am Law 200 ranking this year. The preliminary numbers are based on Law.com reporting, with the full Am Law 200 report scheduled for May.

Each of the firm’s practices performed well throughout 2025, Cooperman said, noting that the digital assets group and the newly-launched government services and controversies group in particular stood out as strong growth areas.

Cooperman said that there was a “modest uptick” in demand throughout the year and that Morrison Cohen also increased its billings rates in line with their competitors, allowing it to obtain increased financial performance while still meeting client needs. A firm representative said in an email that rates at Morrison Cohen increased by over 10% in 2025.

“Our partners, even with rate increases, are in the \$1,000 to \$1,500 range, which can be anywhere from a 30% to 45% discount to Big Law depending on the practice area,” Cooperman said. “All of our lawyers are out of the big shops, but we’re looking to provide sophisticated legal service at a rate that is commensurate with the budgets of our clients and the deal sizes that we’re doing. We look to gain market share for those clients that frankly have been priced out of Big Law.”

Morrison Cohen had 33 equity partners and 27 “income,” or non-equity, partners in 2025. Today, it has 33 equity partners and 21 income partners, a firm representative said in an email to Law.com, partly due to several income part-

ners joining the equity tier and other equity partners transitioning to senior status or leaving the firm.

Meanwhile, Cooperman said that the firm is leveraged roughly 1:1 between partners and associates.

For 2025, the firm had a \$1.5 million average profit per equity partner, including compensation for both equity and nonequity partners. The firm couldn’t immediately provide a breakdown of only average profits per equity partners last year. For 2026 and on, equity partners will be compensated separately as part of the firm’s newly-implemented strategic initiatives.

Cooperman said that the firm shifted its compensation model in 2025 from a retrospective model to a prospective, points-based system. In the prospective system, which some other firms use as well, points are assigned to portions of the firm’s projected budget for the year, and attorneys are paid based on the objectives for the year.

Using the prospective model “changes the mindset” for the partnership in a way that helps benefit the bottom line, Cooperman said, because everyone has a clear idea from the start of roughly what they can expect compensation-wise, if all goals are met.

In line with that change, the firm started setting objective goals for attorney performance in 2025, Cooperman said, and provided support and advice to its attorneys to help them meet those goals as part of its internal strategy changes. Those changes also came with “more rigorous billing and collection policies and processes,” which Cooperman said is part of what helped the firm’s realization rate hold at over 90%

On top of the new prospective compensation system, Morrison Cohen also changed its method for distributing origination credits on transactions from a client-based approach to a matter-by-matter approach. Cooperman said that change was intended to honor the work of attorneys who bring a lot to the table in terms of performance, but do not happen to bring in as many new clients as their colleagues.

“We recognize that business generation obviously is extremely important, but there are a number of partners that are extremely hard workers,” Cooperman said. “Some of them are business generators, some of them are not, but there’s a value obviously in that.”

For 2026, Cooperman said that the firm expects to see continued growth for its new government strategies and controversies practice and added that he is seeing bullish sentiments among dealmakers about higher demand on the transaction front. Those bullish feelings may change, though, Cooperman said.

The Trump administration’s priorities can “create or destroy” business opportunities for any firm, Cooperman said, noting that the firm’s government strategies and controversies practice is partially an outgrowth of the current political landscape.

“There’s still some instability, geopolitical instability, and you never know which way that’s going to kill things,” Cooperman said. “I think we felt similarly bullish coming into 2025, and then we were facing tariffs. So, it’s hard to know, but I think we’re certainly poised to have a growth year in all of those areas.”

© Ryan Harroff can be reached at ryan.harroff@alm.com.

Calendar

WEDNESDAY JAN. 28

NY State Bar (Non CLE)
The End-of-Life Journey with our Beloved Animals Session 1 (of 3)
nysba.org/events/the-end-of-life-journey-with-our-beloved-animals-session-1/
Informational Event
Virtual

NY City Bar (Non CLE)
A Day in the Life of an In-House Counsel
12:30 p.m. – 2 p.m.
Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=NLI012826&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

Coloring Outside the Law
The Full Spectrum of Tech Law—Pixels, Privacy and Progress
6 p.m. – 7 p.m.
Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=DEI012826&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

Practising Law Institute
Bridge-the-Gap I: Ethics and Skills for Newly Admitted New York Attorneys 2026
8:45 a.m. – 5:45 p.m.
<https://www.pli.edu/programs/bridge-the-gap-i-ethics-and-skills-for-newly-admitted-new-york-attorneys/>

THURSDAY, JAN. 29

NY City Bar (CLE)
CLE Title: Artificial Intelligence and Federal Courts: What Lawyers Need to Know
11 a.m. – 2 p.m.
CLE Credits: TBD
Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB012926&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

Practising Law Institute
Private Fund Regulatory Developments and Compliance Challenges 2026
1 p.m. – 5 p.m.
<https://www.pli.edu/programs/private-fund-regulatory-developments-and-compliance-challenges/>

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

Practising Law Institute
Addressing Domestic Violence 2026: Representation in a Complex Custody Case
1:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.
<https://www.pli.edu/programs/domestic-violence/>

MONDAY FEB. 2

NY State Bar (CLE)
AI and the Future of the Courts

nysba.org/events/ai-the-future-of-the-courts/
1 CLE credit
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE)
Resistance and Opportunity: Using Dispute Prevention to Preserve Relationships
nysba.org/events/resistance-and-opportunity-using-dispute-prevention-to-preserve-relationships/
Informational Program
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE)
Investment and Economic Climates for International Investors: Perspectives from the USA, UAE and Kuwait
nysba.org/events/investment-economic-climates-for-international-investors-perspectives-from-the-us-a-u-a-e-and-kuwait/
Informational Program
Virtual

TUESDAY FEB. 3

NY State Bar (Non CLE)
Navigating Brazil’s 2026 VASP Rules: Impacts on Crypto and Stablecoin Providers
nysba.org/events/navigating-brazils-2026-vasp-rules-impacts-on-crypto-and-stablecoin-providers/

Unwind and Uplift: Women in Law and SkinSpirit
nysba.org/events/unwind-uplift-women-in-law-at-skinspirit/
In Person » Page 7

Discovery

« Continued from page 4
default approach. There, the court granted a Section 1782 applicant’s subpoena request to the Clearing House Payments Company L.L.C. (“CHIPS”) for U.S. correspondent banking records of international banking wire transfers. In the underlying litigation, based in the United Kingdom, the applicants sued to recover billions of dollars of assets that allegedly were misappropriated by their foreign adversaries.

The CHIPS subpoena sought documents evidencing the assets’ misappropriation; to track and trace

applicants to permit other parties to inspect subpoenaed materials. . . [there is] no binding authority requiring such access in all cases.” Instead, district courts retain discretion to determine disclosure on a case-by-case basis.

‘Bourlakova’s’ Potential Impact on Cross-Border Discovery

The *Bourlakova* decision may make Section 1782 even more attractive to foreign litigants, who now can seek U.S. discovery without necessarily having to share it with opponents abroad. This shift could dramatically alter litigation strategies. Access to one-sided dis-

By confirming the absence of any blanket requirement to share Section 1782 materials with foreign adversaries, ‘Bourlakova’ enhances the statute’s appeal.

the assets; and to quantify damages. After the Section 1782 applicant declined to share the CHIPS records with its foreign adversary, the foreign adversary moved the district court to compel. The court denied the motion, leaving it to the judge in the U.K. proceeding to determine whether and when the foreign adversary was entitled to disclosure of the CHIPS records.

The Second Circuit affirmed, holding that Rule 45 imposes no blanket rule requiring foreign litigants to share Section 1782 discovery with their foreign adversaries. The Second Circuit ruled that “[a]lthough district courts have in some § 1782 proceedings required

covery—even before a foreign case is filed—may allow Section 1782 applicants to tailor pleadings to available evidence or refine strategy in pending cases using information their adversaries lack.

U.S. financial institutions, frequent targets of Section 1782 subpoenas, should anticipate increased burdens. With demand for Section 1782 discovery up significantly over the last decade, *Bourlakova* may further accelerate the trend.

Key challenges for U.S. financial institutions and other common Section 1782 subpoena recipients include increased compliance costs and operational burdens associated with responding to the

Minneapolis

« Continued from page 2

ever, he said the firm stood with the businesses that signed onto the open letter asking for de-escalation of tensions.

Taft, meanwhile, “has no plans to issue public comment at this time,” that source said.

Ivan Fong, the former general counsel and secretary of Medtronic, observed that there has been a recent “shift away from companies issuing public statements on current events or policy issues that some may view as not core to their business or operations.”

Some companies might have been expected to take a public stance on issues such as DEI, voting rights, or gun safety, he said. “Yet many companies have learned

to tread more carefully, for fear of retaliation or other adverse consequences by the government.”

This is less a matter of courage, and more a matter of prudence and doing what’s best for all stakeholders, he said, adding the letter by the 60 CEOs of Minnesota companies was “a highly significant contribution to the public conversation.”

“I was also gratified that the letter calls for ‘immediate de-escalation of tensions’ and for cooperation between federal, state, and local agencies to investigate and find solutions,” he said. “Having worked through several previous calls for companies to take a public position or issue a public statement, I know how difficult it can be to get multiple companies to align on a single statement that says something meaningful.”

Charles Elson, a retired Universi-

ty of Delaware business professor, noted the balancing act confronting businesses that speak out on local or national controversies.

“You can alienate a customer base, alienate a supplier, alienate the government,” he said in an interview, adding that even at one company, the shareholders, the customers, and the employees all have different views and may not have been a part of the conversation. There’s also a balancing act between making the local community happy and risking shareholders nationally, he says, and this is something companies weigh behind the scenes before deciding to speak out.

Law.com reporter Michael Gennaro contributed to this report.

© Patrick Smith can be reached at patrick.smith@alm.com.

\$1B Settlement

« Continued from page 2

Amazon’s return policy, which is published on its website, states that “[m]ost items can be returned for a refund or replacement/exchange within 30 days of delivery as long as they are in original or unused condition”—but in practice, according to the complaint, Amazon frequently recharged its customers for returned items or failed to issue the appropriate refunds in a timely matter or at all, despite records confirming the products at issue had arrived at Amazon warehouses after being dropped off at designated Amazon return kiosks.

Amazon “routinely fails to deliver on its promise of free, no hassle returns and instead recharges customers who have returned items within the return window, despite Amazon’s own records establishing that it has received such items,” the complaint asserted.

In March 2024, the court consolidated the complaint with two other consumer fraud cases—captioned *Strivastava v. Amazon.com Inc.* and *Clark v. Amazon.com Inc.*—filed in October and November of 2023, per court records. On April 29, 2025, Whitehead rejected Amazon’s partial motion to dismiss the suit after finding that plaintiffs had plausibly alleged quasi-contract claims and a conversion claim.

“Following an internal review in 2025, we identified a small subset of returns where we issued a refund without the payment completing, or where we could not verify that the correct item had been sent back to us, so no refund had been issued,” said an Amazon spokesperson in an email.

“We started issuing refunds in 2025 for these returns and are providing additional compensation and refunds to eligible customers per the settlement agreement. We have taken steps to fix the payment issue and made process changes to more promptly contact customers about unresolved returns going forward.”

© Kat Black can be reached at kat.black@alm.com.

Expert Analysis / Real Estate Trends / Disciplinary Proceedings

Evidence

«Continued from page 3
ing. The message is partly remembered and partly invented by the device. The spouse is credible. The testimony is honest. The evidence is not real.
New York's current rule, which permits authentication based on witness testimony that the document "accurately reflects the communication," is inadequate here (See *Robert A. Barker & Vincent C. Alexander, Evidence in New York State and Federal Courts* §9.3 [2d ed.] [collecting cases]). The witness cannot testify to the synthetic portions because no human ever saw them.
The evidence has memory, but no history. What is the court to decide, when credibility is not the issue?

B. Medical Malpractice and The Image That Never Existed in That Form

In a medical malpractice action, a patient downloads an MRI scan from a hospital portal. On that image, a lesion appears distinct and sharply boundaries. Plaintiff's expert testifies the failure to diagnose was indefensible.
The defense radiologist responds that the image provided is not the diagnostic radiograph used by clinicians. The hospital system automatically applied contrast enhancement and boundary sharpening. What appears "obvious" to the jury never existed in any clinician's view. The metadata confirms authenticity. But authenticity

now refers to the generation of an image, not the depiction of a reality. The hospital's imaging system applies enhancement algorithms that interpolate pixel gradients and sharpen boundaries. The clarity is synthetic, appearing precisely because the algorithm "completed" visual information based on statistical prediction, not observation. The image may therefore misrepresent the diagnostic ambiguity that existed at the time of care.
Further compounding the problem, many imaging systems run on proprietary, closed-source diagnostic pipelines, meaning neither litigants nor the court may be able to examine how the image was generated or altered. The defense may therefore be functionally unable to challenge the transformation that produced the very evidence offered against it.
Chain of custody may be impeccable. Metadata may be intact. But authenticity in this situation refers to the artifact as processed, not to clinical reality.

C. Federal Litigation and the Choice-of-Law Problem That Isn't Procedural

In a §1983 action alleging excessive force, video footage is challenged because portions of corrupted frames were reconstructed. Plaintiff invokes New York's contextual authentication doctrine; the defense insists on *Federal Rule of Evidence 901*.
But neither rule addresses the central problem: both assume that recording is a function of observation. We have entered an era

in which recording is a function of inference. The debate is not which law applies. It is whether any existing evidentiary standard is designed for synthetic evidentiary objects.

III. Criminal Prosecution: The Framed and the False Denier

Criminal law faces the most acute danger, not only of wrongful conviction, but of wrongful acquittal. As scholars have described,

The legitimacy of judicial process does not depend on certainty, but on the belief that truth is reachable. Trials exist because truth can be obscured. Yet the process presumes that there is a truth to be found.

artificial intelligence produces what has been termed the "liar's dividend." The existence of plausible forgery permits the guilty to deny the real and encourages the innocent to be framed by the fake.

A. The Voice Recording That May Be Either Authentic or Perfectly Forged

A recording surfaces in which a defendant appears to threaten a witness. A prosecution expert testifies the cadence, stress points, and phonetic patterns match the defendant. A defense expert testifies that modern voice synthesis can replicate breath spacing, vowel glide, and emotional tone.⁴ The question for the jury is not whether the defendant spoke. The question

is whether speech is knowable. Traditional exclusionary rule doctrine assumes that evidence can be challenged and evaluated through the adversarial process. The structure of *People v. Patterson*, (93 NY2d 80 [1999]), and its progeny relies on the premise that scientific or technical evidence may be scrutinized, contested, and understood in the courtroom. But AI-generated recordings may not meaningfully submit to such testing, because the underlying event

recordings of actual people and enables the creation of realistic impersonations out of digital whole cloth.
The result is realistic-looking video or audio making it appear that someone said or did something. Although deep fakes can be created with the consent of people being featured, more often they will be created without it, the event did not occur, even though the recording appears coherent, contextual, and socially plausible.

C. Evidence That Judges Can No Longer Evaluate With Experience Alone

The law has long relied on the intuition of judges and jurors to assess the credibility of photographs, recordings, and written communications. But intuition is useless where the artificial presents itself with the surface characteristics of the real.
When false evidence is indistinguishable from true, the adversarial process risks collapsing into theater.

IV. The Silent Witness Doctrine Under Strain

In *People v. Price*, (29 NY3d 472 [2017]), the Court of Appeals reaffirmed that video evidence may be admitted without eyewitness sponsorship if the recording system is shown to be reliable. This is the "silent witness" doctrine. The "silent witness" method focuses on the reliability of the system and processes producing the recording (See, e.g., *14 New York Evidentiary*

may not exist at all. This creates a new tension in suppression jurisprudence: the exclusionary rule presumes that flawed or unreliable evidence can be exposed through challenge, while synthetic evidence can be perfectly consistent yet wholly untethered to reality.

B. The Deepfake Alibi

Defendants may now introduce synthetic video placing themselves at other locations. If the state challenges the video as fabricated, it may carry the burden of proving a negative: that the digital impersonation is increasingly realistic and convincing. Deepfake technology is the cutting-edge of that trend. It leverages machine-learning algorithms to insert faces and voices into video and audio

Foundations §12 LexisNexis; 2d edition [June 17, 2015]).
But many modern surveillance systems now use interpolative frame prediction, the software guesses what occurred between frames to create smoother motion. The system may be reliable; the depicted event may never have occurred. The silent witness may now be testifying to fiction.

V. Conclusion: Preserving the "Real"

The legitimacy of judicial process does not depend on certainty, but on the belief that truth is reachable. Trials exist because truth can be obscured. Yet the process presumes that there is a truth to be found.
Artificial intelligence challenges not the accuracy of evidence, but its ontology. It produces artifacts that seem to document the past but have no past. It allows narratives to emerge without events, memory without occurrence, representation without referent. This is not merely a technological problem. It is a philosophical one.
Courts are the institutions tasked with distinguishing what is real. We do not create truth, but we recognize it. If we lose the ability to distinguish the "real" from the "manufactured", adjudication risks becoming a contest of performances rather than a search for truth.
Although there is much work to do, it is abundantly clear that our responsibility now is to preserve the conditions under which truth, as a universal, may still be known.

Parental

«Continued from page 3
that establishes a new status quo. This "temporary" decree often remains in effect for months or even years while the case crawls toward a full fact-finding hearing. As time passes, the judicial decree itself fuels a deepening rift between parent and child. A twelve-

can tradition" of parental rights, the following reforms should be implemented:

Codifying Expedited Evidentiary Hearings: New York should amend Family Court Act Article 6 to include provisions analogous to *FCA §§ 1027 and 1028*. This would grant respondent-parents the statutory right to demand an expedited evidentiary

The statutory framework supports this through *FCA §§1027 and 1028*, which provide for expedited hearings—a right that applies even when the child remains in the home but a parent has been excluded by an order of protection.

year study commissioned by the American Bar Association confirms that separation time is the ally of an alienating parent and the enemy of the targeted parent—a reality I have witnessed firsthand in countless litigations. Stanley S. Clawar & Brynne V. Rivlin, *Children Held Hostage: Identifying Brainwashed Children, Presenting a Case, and Crafting Solutions* (2d ed. 2013).

Closing the Due Process Gap: A Call for Statutory Harmony

To rectify this double standard and honor the "enduring Ameri-

hearing—within days, not months—whenever a court issues an interim order that significantly restricts parental access or modifies the existing custody arrangement.

Adopting a "Harm" Threshold for Interim Disruptions: The standard for issuing "temporary" orders that disrupt the parent-child bond must be elevated. Rather than acting on "adequate relevant information" that is often unvetted and one-sided, courts should be required to find that the

interim order is necessary to prevent a specific risk of harm, mirroring the "imminent danger" rigor found in Article 10.

Mandating Time-Limited Interim Orders: To prevent the "temporary" status quo from becoming a permanent rift, Article 6 should mandate that any interim order restricting access is subject to a strict expiration date unless a full fact-finding hearing is commenced. As established in *Matter of Emmanuel C.F.*, the judiciary must reject piecemeal adjournments that allow judicial decrees to weaponize time against the parent-child relationship.

Ultimately, the level of protection afforded to a family should not depend on the identity of the petitioner. By bridging the gap between Article 10 and Article 6, New York can ensure that the fundamental right to rear one's child is protected with the same constitutional rigor, regardless of the procedural gateway. Justice for parents and children alike should not be determined by which article of the Family Court Act is invoked, but by the fundamental right to remain a family.

Standing Case

«Continued from page 5
tions related to plaintiffs' standing in consumer and privacy litigation. As the U.S. Supreme Court heightened requirements for plaintiffs in cases such as *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* and *Spokeo v. Robins*, some California courts of appeal have more recently held that standing is more closely tied to the legislative intent behind a particular statute.
Ted Mermin, executive director of the Center for Consumer Law & Economic Justice, pointed to California appellate court opinions in *Chai v. Velocity Investments, Gura-car v. Student Loan Solutions* and

Kashanian v. National Enterprise Systems, Inc. as cases where justices found plaintiffs did not need to suffer concrete harm to pursue statutory damages.

"That's what the context behind this whole issue in *Yeh v. Barrington Pacific*" is, Mermin said.
Attorneys for Barrington argued that the court in *Yeh* should be guided by the Fifth District Court of Appeal's 2022 opinion in *Limon v. Circle K Stores Inc.*, which found that plaintiffs suing under the Fair Credit Reporting Act must show an actual injury, not just a violation, to prevail. But the Second District panel in *Yeh* declined to follow Limon, disagreeing with some of the Fifth District's conclusions and finding "key differences" between

the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act and the California Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act.

"For all these reasons, we conclude plaintiffs need not prove actual harm to bring an ICRAA claim; a violation of their informational rights alone entitles them to the statutory penalty and provides standing to pursue an action," Edmon wrote.

The Second District did reject plaintiffs' request for damages under a second statute, the Unfair Competition Law, finding that it does require a showing of concrete injury.

@ Cheryl Miller can be reached at cheryl.miller@alm.com.

Pakfar

«Continued from page 5
allocation issues will be critical to helping us move faster and execute with confidence," said Jamey Seely, Cruso's chief legal officer.

With Pakfar's appointment, Seely will continue as the company's chief legal officer and secretary but will shift her focus toward enterprise governance, corporate strategy and capital markets mat-

ters, areas that are crucial for the business as it contemplates a 2026 public offering.

In a statement, Pakfar said: "Crusoe is building infrastructure at a scale and pace that is truly unique. I am honored to join a team that is redefining how energy, real estate, and AI infrastructure come together, and to help support the next phase of the company's growth."
Pakfar received his bachelor's degree in political science from

UCLA. His law degree is from UC Hastings, which was renamed UC San Francisco three years ago.

@ Michael Gennaro can be reached at michael.gennaro@alm.com.

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

Disciplinary Proceeding

Matter of Xiaofang Zhong, an attorney and counselor-at-law

Motion No. 2025-05698

Appellate Division, First Department

Kern, J.P., Kennedy, Rodriguez III, Higglitt, Chan, JJ.

Decided: January 22, 2026

Jorge Dopico, Chief Attorney, Attorney Grievance Committee, New York (Louis J. Bara, of counsel), for petitioner.

Respondent, pro se.

Per curiam—Respondent Xiaofang Zhong was admitted to the practice of law in the State of New York by the Third Judicial Department on June 19, 2012. At all times relevant to this proceeding, respondent maintained a business address in the First Judicial Department (see Rules for Atty Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] § 1240.7 [a][2]).
By order dated May 21, 2025, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) suspended respondent for six months, on consent, based on respondent's multiple violations of USPTO trademark signature rules. Specifically, according to the USPTO order, respondent, whose practice focused on patent, trademark, and copyright law, was referred thousands of clients by four Chinese entities. Despite the USPTO's unequivocal directions prohibiting individuals other than the named signatory from signing electronic trademark documents, respondent signed hundreds of trademark and registration documents on his cli-

ent's behalf. Additionally, USPTO records also demonstrated that "0,025 trademark applications were filed incorrectly identifying respondent as the named signatory, rather than the name of the person who had signed the submission that accompanied the filing."

Respondent acknowledged that his violation of the USPTO trademark signature rules "indicated a lack of competence" or "lack of care" in handling trademark matters entrusted to him. He further acknowledged that his violation of those rules "caused actual or potential harm to the intellectual property rights of his trademark clients and has adversely affected the integrity of the USPTO trademark registration and maintenance process." As a result of these findings, respondent and the USPTO entered into a Settlement Agreement in which respondent admitted that his actions violated several USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, which are substantially similar to the New York Rules of Professional Conduct, and respondent was suspended for six months, on consent.

Respondent timely reported his discipline to the Third Judicial Department, where he was admitted (see 22 NYCRR 1240.13[d]).

By motion dated August 6, 2025, the Attorney Grievance Committee (AGC) seeks an order, pursuant to the doctrine of reciprocal discipline as set forth 22 NYCRR 1240.13(d), and Judiciary Law § 90(2), finding that respondent was disciplined by a foreign jurisdiction, directing him to demonstrate why discipline should not be imposed in New York for the misconduct underlying his discipline in the USPTO. Respondent appears in this proceeding

pro se and does not object to the imposition of reciprocal discipline.

A six month suspension, as requested by the AGC, is the appropriate reciprocal discipline in this matter as it is commensurate with the suspension imposed by the USPTO and in accord with this Court's precedent involving comparable conduct (see *Matter of Milara*, 194 AD3d 108, 111 [1st Dept 2021]; *Matter of Blumenthal*, 165 AD3d 85, 86 [1st Dept 2018]). Additionally, none of the defenses available under 22 NYCRR 1240.13(b) are available to respondent because he was on notice of the misconduct allegations at issue and entered into a Settlement Agreement in the USPTO proceeding, where he admitted to engaging in misconduct in violation of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct. Respondent's admitted misconduct also violated rules 1.1(a), 1.3(a), 8.4(c), and 8.4(d) of the New York Rules of Professional Conduct (22 NYCRR 1200.0), which are substantially similar to the USPTO rules.

Accordingly, the AGC's motion for reciprocal discipline, on consent, should be granted, and respondent suspended from the practice of law for a period of six months, effective 30 days from the date of this order, and until further order of this court.

All concur.

DECISIONS DATABASE

The Law Journal's decision editors find and summarize rulings by New York's federal and state judges that help members of the bench and bar stay on the cutting edge. This decision and many more are stored on our comprehensive, searchable database at <https://www.law.com/newyorklawjournal/case-digests/>

Calendar

«Continued from page 6

WEDNESDAY FEB. 4

Nassau Community College Getting Started and Protecting Your Rights as an Entertainer or Artist
Discussion will include protecting your name, image and likeness, choosing and using an agent and navigating contract issues
3 p.m.
whpc 90.3 FM radio voice stream or podcast anytime
www.nccradio.org

THURSDAY FEB. 5

NY State Bar (CLE) How Business Can Help Veterans in Transition
nysba.org/events/how-business-can-help-veterans-in-transition/
1 CLE credit
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE) Thriving in the Chaos: Mastering the Professional-Caregiver Balance
nysba.org/events/thriving-in-the-chaos-mastering-the-professional-caregiver-balance/
Informational Program
Virtual

TUESDAY, FEB. 10

New York Women's Bar Association NYWBA Elder Law and Disabilities Committee Lunch and Learn
1 p.m.
On Zoom
Bring your questions for City Council Member Crystal Hudson,

who in February 2025 introduced a resolution to call upon the State Legislature to introduce and pass legislation to create a statewide public guardianship system.
RSVP to elderlawchairs@nywba.org

NY State Bar (CLE) Trust Protectors in New York: Drafting MAPTs, SNTs and Other Irrevocable Trusts to Ensure Success
nysba.org/events/trust-protectors-in-new-york-drafting-mapts-snts-and-other-irrevocable-trusts-to-ensure-success/
1 CLE credit
Virtual

TUESDAY, FEB. 10-WEDNESDAY FEB. 11

NY State Bar (CLE) Commercial Litigation Academy
nysba.org/events/commercial-litigation-academy-2026/
16 CLE credits
Hybrid: Albany, New York City

WEDNESDAY FEB. 11

NY State Bar (Non CLE) End-of-Life Journey with our Beloved Animals Session 2 (of 3)
nysba.org/events/the-end-of-life-journey-with-our-beloved-animals-session-2/
Virtual

THURSDAY, FEB. 12

Federal Bar Council (CLE) Hot Topics in Legal Ethics II
6 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
1.5 CLE credits
Location: Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, 919 Third Avenue, New York
<https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-ce9f-4fe4-0b49108a6010/details>

com/events/a5720928-0078-ce9f-4fe4-0b49108a6010/details

TUESDAY FEB. 17

NY State Bar (CLE) Truth about Succession Planning: What High-Performing Leaders Do Differently
nysba.org/events/the-truth-about-succession-planning-what-high-performing-leaders-do-differently/
1 CLE credit
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE) NYSBA Mediator Roundtable Series
nysba.org/events/nysba-mediator-roundtable-series-february-2026-edition/
Informational event
Virtual

WEDNESDAY FEB. 18

NY State Bar (CLE) Employment Law 2026: Emerging Trends and Regulatory Shifts Across Federal, State and City Levels
nysba.org/events/employment-law-2026-emerging-trends-and-regulatory-shifts-across-federal-state-and-city-levels/
1 CLE credit
Virtual

NY State Bar (Non CLE) The Tax Drag of NYC: Advanced Wealth Management Strategies for New Yorkers
nysba.org/events/the-tax-drag-of-nyc-advanced-wealth-management-strategies-for-new-yorkers/
Virtual

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

Real Estate Trends

SEQRA

«Continued from page 5
injury different in kind or degree from that suffered by the public at large.

Courts may infer potential aggravation from these owners' proximity to the affected property, but proximity alone is not sufficient. Such challengers must show their alleged injury is environmental and falls within SEQRA's zone of interests, rather than reflecting generalized community opposition or economic concerns.

'Matter of Seneca Meadows'

In 2016, following years of residents' complaints about odors from Seneca Meadow Inc.'s (SMI) solid waste disposal facility—the only one that operated within

the Town of Seneca Falls—the Town of Seneca Falls Town Board passed a local law that prohibited solid waste disposal facilities from operating in the town, but existing licensed facilities could continue operating until the earlier of their permit expiring or December 31, 2025.

SMI challenged the law on several grounds in the Seneca County Supreme Court, including that the Town Board violated SEQRA requirements by failing to take the required hard look at relevant areas of environmental concern. SMI moved for partial summary judgment on its SEQRA cause of action to declare the new law invalid.

The defendants-respondents, including the Town of Seneca Falls, opposed the motion on the grounds that SMI lacked standing to assert its SEQRA cause of action.

The Seneca County Supreme Court granted the motion for partial summary judgment, holding that SMI had standing and that the Town Board failed to take the required hard look at the potential environmental impacts the landfill closure

Standing under SEQRA does not turn on whether the owner can identify a particular environmental harm, but on whether the agency took the required 'hard look.'

would cause when it determined the new law would have no significant adverse environmental impacts.

On appeal, the Appellate Division reversed the Supreme Court's judgment. In a 3-2 decision, the majority held SMI lacked standing because it failed to establish that "it had suffered or would suffer an environmental injury" even though

it had alleged it would suffer economic injuries.

Two judges dissented, writing that they would have affirmed the Supreme Court's judgment based on *Har* and *Gernatt*, that SMI did not have to allege an environmental

injury.

Relying on its prior decisions in *Har* and *Gernatt*, the court held SMI had standing as the owner of property directly regulated by the new law. As the court explained, a property owner whose land is the subject of the challenged governmental action has a legally cognizable interest in ensuring that a government agency satisfies SEQRA before proceeding with an action.

The court emphasized that an affected property owner's standing does not turn on whether the owner can identify a particular environmental harm resulting from the action. Rather, the owner's interest lies in ensuring that the agency engaged in the procedural safeguards SEQRA requires, including taking a hard look at potential environmental impacts and provid-

ing a "reasoned elaboration" for its determination.

Clarifying Standing

The Court of Appeals' decision in *Seneca Meadows* reinforces the principle that standing to challenge SEQRA compliance is not uniform for all challengers. Courts will assess affected property owners' standing to bring SEQRA claims differently from how they assess neighboring owners or other groups. For the former, ownership of the regulated property, even a class of one, itself will often establish standing. For the latter, they must show a concrete environmental injury within SEQRA's zone of interests. Economic harm or generalized opposition to a governmental action, without more, will not confer standing.

Realty Law

«Continued from page 5
commercial and public development.»

The court stated that on the "full summary judgment record", the "case for the facial infirmity of the POW Law has been strengthened." The record showed "many more ways in which the POW Law treats religious development less favorably than comparable secular land uses." Thus, the court granted the plaintiffs' motion and denied the defendant's motion, and declared the POW Law "facially invalid under the United States Constitution."

The plaintiffs had "endeavored to develop a temple for assembly and worship," since 2007, or earlier. The property previously contained a commercial nursery. It is located on a road upon which 32,000 vehicles travel on an average work day. It is across the street from the NYS Dept. of Transportation equipment transfer and maintenance yard, which "stores heavy machinery including dump trucks, salting trucks, snowplows, front loaders, and cherry pickers."

In March 2001, the village adopted the POW Law. The POW Law "divested the Board of Zoning Appeals of jurisdiction pertaining to religious land use applications and vested it with the Village Board of Trustees." The "purpose of the POW Law was, at least in part, to 'maintain the existing character of the Village'...as a low density, residential community." The uses governed by the POW Law "would not pay property taxes to the...Village, an issue that has been the subject of concerns expressed by some of its leaders."

The village had issued findings with respect to the POW Law that included: "[r]evised special permit standards for institutional uses such as houses of worship and schools will help to preserve the village's low density residential character. In addition, the existing standards will be enhanced to mitigate potential land use compatibility impacts of institutional uses with residential neighborhoods."

The proposed zoning text amendments include new standards to address aesthetic, traffic, community service and other impacts associated with increased levels of activity related to institutional uses.... The proposed zoning text amendments... would also help to preserve the village's estate character by encouraging the preservation of existing mansions and their surrounding estate areas...."

The village findings noted that some institutional facilities and related levels of on-site activity may have "significant adverse impacts on established residential areas, especially in relation to visual and aesthetic character." It noted that "locating not-for-profit schools and places of worship in appropriate places will help them to function better and, at the same time, minimize their potential impacts on tranquil residential areas."

The then Mayor had stated that the POW Law would "regulate the growth in the village to minimize the impact on people who lived here...." He also testified that "[w]e have attempted...to maintain the village in a similar manner that has been from the time that it was incorporated back in 1929; a rural area of private homes and ninety-eight percent of the property or ninety-five percent of the property is in private homes hands and whenever a piece of property gets developed, it normally is for home use, not for a commercial use." The defendants also cited the need to control "traffic, parking, noise and crowds."

The court stated that "these legislative findings and statements seem removed from reality." The site is "situated across from a heavy machinery yard and is a stone's throw away from the Northern State Parkway and the infamous Long Island Expressway,

the area's busiest roadway that, at times, becomes the most congested traffic artery in the nation." The court opined that the "location of the site, and its proximity to major highway interchanges and construction storage yards, belies claims relating to the 'visual and aesthetic character' of the area."

The court then reviewed the various land use restrictions that govern places of worship. It noted that the zoning code requires that places of worship have a minimum lot area of 12 acres. That provision "compares unfavorably with the minimum requirements required for other property development and uses, including livestock farms (10 acres), stables, barns and sheds for sheltering horses (one to four acres) and commercial establishments (one acre)." The POW Law requires the houses of worship to "maintain at least 35 percent of their 12 acres of lot area, and 50% of any lot area in excess thereof, in a natural, undeveloped state." The court stated that the law "makes no such provision for other uses of property in the same residence districts."

Additionally, properties developed for residential use have a maximum lot coverage requirement of 25%, while the POW Law limits places of worship to maximum lot coverage of 20% for the first 12 acres and 15% of additional lot areas. Residential development may include "a maximum building area of between six to ten percent of the lot area;" "the POW Law limits religious establishments to a maximum area of four percent of the first 12 acres and three percent beyond that."

Moreover, the POW Law permits "a maximum permitted building volume for places of worship, as compared to the amount of land owned, of approximately half of what is allowed for certain secular establishments." The POW Law also "requires substantially greater parking areas for religious developments as compared to secular developments."

After reviewing additional restrictions with respect to "locations and frontage" and "minimum yard setbacks," the court noted that in certain residential districts, "a pit of manure may be located closer to the property line than a place of worship."

The POW Law limits maximum building height of a place of worship to 25 feet. The "zoning restrictions appear far more generous toward other types of development, with principal residences, private golf clubs, and commercial horse stables allocated maximum of 35 feet, plus accessory buildings of 20 to 25 feet. The only...less generous height limitation...are restaurants, which are restricted to a maximum height of 20 feet."

The village's zoning consultant testified that he had recommended "that the permitted height for non-residential uses go to either 35 or 45 feet." He stated that the village "determined that it should remain at 25 feet, and then they would use their flexibility to increase it and would give them greater leverage, authority with respect to these uses to allow them to go to a greater height, maybe, in exchange for greater screening or increased setback or something like that." A former mayor described the POW Law as a "negotiating weapon wielded against religious groups."

The defendants asserted hearsay objections to testimony from the consultant that drafted the POW Law. This consultant is an 86-year-old Florida resident who had been suffering from "progressing Parkinson's Disease for more than a decade." The court held, inter alia, that the village's argument ignores the evidentiary standard applicable to a motion for summary judgment.

The court then cited case law relating to the First Amendment provision that states that government "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof (Free Exercise Clause)."

The court explained that the Free Exercise Clause "does not relieve an individual of the obligation to comply with a valid and neutral law of general applicability." A "neutral and generally applicable policy is subject to only rational-basis review...." However, "[o]fficial action 'burdening religious conduct that is not both neutral and generally applicable, however, is subject to strict scrutiny.'"

The court noted that "a facial challenge to a law or ordinance considers only the text of the law or ordinance itself, not its application to the particular circumstances of an individual."

The defendant questioned whether "the other preferred uses discussed...including residential developments, private golf clubs, commercial establishments, restaurants, commercial horse stables, and livestock farms—are comparable for making this determination." However, the Supreme Court held that "whether two activities are comparable for purposes of the Free Exercise Clause must be judged against the asserted gov-

The court noted that "a facial challenge to a law or ordinance considers only the text of the law or ordinance itself, not its application to the particular circumstances of an individual." The court noted that "a facial challenge to a law or ordinance considers only the text of the law or ordinance itself, not its application to the particular circumstances of an individual."

ernment interest that justifies the regulation at issue, adding comparability is concerned with the risks various activities pose, not the reasons why people gather."

The village cited a "laundry list of interests, many without explanation, including 'traffic, parking, noise, crowds, effect on water and sewage services.'" However, the court found that "[l]ittle evidence is offered by the village concerning the nature of the risks to these generalized (and largely unconvincing) interests posed by the various uses." For instance, farms and commercial horse stables may involve "equal if not far greater risks to water and sewage services than religious buildings." Moreover, "[t]raffic, parking, noise and crowd issues created by restaurants and commercial establishments certainly seem comparable to those presented by houses of worship." The court found that "in every instance, religious institutions are treated less favorably under the statute."

The court observed that the POW Law is not a "neutral law of general applicability" and therefore "strict scrutiny review shifts the burden to the defendant to 'show that the religious exercise at issue is more dangerous than those activities even when the same precautions are applied,' and 'narrow tailoring requires the government to show that measures less restrictive of the First Amendment activity could not address its interests.'"

The court found that the village had not made "any such showing." The court explained that "undisputed and indisputable facts render it beyond doubt that the POW Law treats comparable secular activities more favorably than religious exercise, and thus its restrictions trigger strict scrutiny."

The court further stated that the defense "shamelessly asserts that the POW Law was subject to 'an independent assessment by the District Court which found it was a neutral and generally applicable law and constitutional and did not proscribe more religious conduct than necessary.'"

The defendants cited Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre v. Incorporated Village of Old Westbury, 128 F. Supp. 3d 566 (EDNY 2015). The court explained that such argument ignored the lengthy analysis in a prior decision involving the subject dispute, wherein the court distinguished

the Diocese of Rockville Centre decision and held it inapplicable to the subject case. The court also noted that "intervening law...raises additional questions about the continuing viability of the Diocese of Rockville Centre decision."

The village had relied on a land use review conducted by its outside consultant. That review claimed allegedly addressed "the issue of the recent proliferation of institutional development applications in the village." However, the consultant testified that the village had "opted to ignore" his recommendations "without legitimate reason." The court opined that "[d]isgracefully, the... evidence demonstrates that the village opted to disregard the recommendations concerning building height to gain leverage in negotiations with religious organizations."

Thus, the court held that the POW Law "unconstitutionally discriminates against the free exercise of religion and it's therefore facially invalid."

Given the years of litigation and costs thereof the court urged "all involved to work together to

The court noted that "a facial challenge to a law or ordinance considers only the text of the law or ordinance itself, not its application to the particular circumstances of an individual." The court noted that "a facial challenge to a law or ordinance considers only the text of the law or ordinance itself, not its application to the particular circumstances of an individual."

reach a satisfactory resolution of this matter." However, they did not "hold out much hope." The court will conduct a trial. Issues will include the plaintiffs' damage claim. They claimed inter alia, that they lost more than \$15 million in pledged donor commitments and the Rabbi lost earnings and benefits in excess of \$5 million. The court noted that given the significant time frame involved, which predates this litigation by "nearly a decade", there may be "speculative" aspects and possible "double-counting" the litigation "risks and costs will be substantial."

Lubavitch of Old Westbury Inc. v. Inc. Vill of Old Westbury, NY, USDC, Eastern District of New York, Case No. 2:08-cv-05081. Decided Oct. 30, 2025. Brown, J.

Construction—Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction Enjoining Defendant From Performing Construction Work On a 41-Story Residential Building Denied—Court Cited NYC Department of Buildings Report Indicating That the DOB Observed No Damage or Structural Defects—Money Damages May Suffice

This decision involved disputes arising from the "superstructure phase" of the defendant's construction of a 41-story residential building complex. The plaintiff owns an adjacent "historic building so designated by the (NYC) Landmarks Preservation Commission." The plaintiff moved for preliminary injunction "enjoining and an order restraining defendant from performing construction work that will cause intrusion or infiltration into plaintiff's property."

The plaintiff alleged that "without approved plans from the Department of Buildings (DOB) and after unsuccessful access license negotiations, defendant's construction activities have caused dust and debris to accumulate in the basement and ground floor levels of plaintiff's property, creating a visible fog that is polluting the air and rendering it hazardous for its residents to breathe."

The plaintiff allegedly sent numerous "cease and desist" notices to defendant, demanding that all drilling work be stopped until defendant could prevent further damage to plaintiff's property. It asserted that its engineers had "confirmed cracks" and defendant

had installed monitoring equipment on plaintiff's property without notice or consent.

The plaintiff claimed that defendant failed "to implement or provide protections required by the (NYC) Building Code (Code)." It also asserted claims for "nuisance..., trespass..., injunction pursuant to RPAPL 871; negligence... and strict liability."

Additionally, the plaintiff sought an order "enjoining defendant from accessing or trespassing on plaintiff's property...."

The plaintiff alleged, inter alia, that "defendant's drilling work has damaged plaintiff's property to the extent that any further work will compromise the property's structural integrity and endanger plaintiff's residents' safety therein." It contended that financial compensation would be an insufficient remedy, since money will not prevent "further damage to the foundation and walls of plaintiff's property." It also argued that the defendant's construction activities were in "disregard of DOB safety regulations."

The plaintiff also argued that the defendant failed to "waterproof or protect plaintiff's property against infiltration, and are also intentional in nature, as they are performed despite a DOB...stop work order issued on January 7, 2025." It further alleged that the defendant's contractors performed "unauthorized sidewalk shed work to aid the drilling work that caused the dust and water intrusion into plaintiff's property."

The plaintiff provided copies of "water infiltration photo, monitoring equipment photo, correspondence with defendant about identified construction defects, a copy of DOB violations, a photo of the sidewalk shed, a geotechnical and monitoring review letter, and reports from...plaintiff's geotechnical engineers...."

The defendant countered that its drilling activities have been pursuant to DOB-approved plans, it complied with the Code and "DOB has appeared at the site on three occasions between February 7, 2025, and March 9, 2025, and has not issued a full or partial stop work order."

The defendant also argued that plaintiff failed to establish irreparable harm since the alleged "dust, noise, and water infiltration are compensable." It asserted that "measures were agreed upon between the parties to address these issues, and there have been no allegations of poor air quality or dust and intrusion on plaintiff's property in January 2025." It further argued that it had "undertaken expansive efforts to mitigate the risk of any future water intrusion, airborne dust, and/or debris."

The defendant asserted that an injunction would be inappropriate since the plaintiff's engineer recommends remedial actions "that would require defendant to access plaintiff's property to protect plaintiff's exposed foundations." It also argued that the "instances of dust intrusion and water infiltration are singular incidents and cannot constitute a nuisance...." Additionally, the defendant argued that trespass claim must fail because the defendant commenced an RPAPL 881 proceeding which established the defendant's "intent to access plaintiff's property lawfully."

Thus, the defendant contended that the plaintiff's allegations as to irreparable harm are "speculative at best and exaggerated in both scope and substance, and therefore the injunction must be denied."

The defendant further argued that delaying its project would "not only jeopardize the building project but also expose it to potentially significant losses, liability to third parties, and loss of financing," and therefore the balance of equities weighs in the defendant's favor. It asserted that the plaintiff faced no "comparable prejudice, and it can be compensated...through monetary relief."

It also stated that it complet-

ed 80% of the drilling activities, and most of the remaining drilling work will occur "away from the area adjacent to plaintiff's property." It contended that the plaintiff's position is "inherently contradictory" since the plaintiff simultaneously recommended that "work be done for which access is required."

The defendant also noted since there is an RPAPL 881 petition pending in a related action, the instant motion "risks conflicting court orders." The defendant also requested that the petitioner post a bond to cover defendant's damages if it is determined that the plaintiff is not entitled to an injunction.

The plaintiff countered that its injunctive relief request is "narrowly tailored to prevent defendant from engaging in construction work that will cause water intrusions and dust/debris on the plaintiff's property." The injunctive relief requested "would not cause all outstanding construction activities to cease insofar as defendant can implement means and methods to mitigate the construction issues alleged here."

The plaintiff noted that injunctive relief in this action would not "nullify the RPAPL 881 proceeding since that action involved court-ordered access to the plaintiff's property to install temporary protections solely involving the project's superstructure phase."

The plaintiff also noted that the Feb. 7, 2025 DOB inspection was conducted at a time when the defendant had stopped drilling adjacent to the plaintiff's building and therefore the fact that the DOB did not issue a stop work order did not show that the drilling work complained of was compliant with the Code. It asserted that the defendant trespassed on its property by placing a sidewalk shed without a license agreement or consent from the plaintiff and had installed monitoring equipment prior to receiving consent from the plaintiff.

The plaintiff further argued that because the DOB approved plans did not mean that the defendant complied with those plans and that the request for a bond is "punitive because the request is not supported by the record" and is meritless. The plaintiff emphasized that it was undisputed that the defendant had "failed to waterproof plaintiff's property...."

The court denied plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction. Although the plaintiff claimed that as of March 7, 2025, it observed additional water intrusion through the cracks in the walls and foundations arising from the defendant's drilling work, "the DOB report indicated that the DOB 'observed no damage or structural defects' at the plaintiff's property during its inspection on March 9, 2025."

The court found that the plaintiff "failed to demonstrate the extent of the structural damage sustained as a result of defendant's construction activity," and the plaintiff did not dispute "that the threat of the alleged injuries will be minimized as the remainder of defendant's construction activities will take place away from plaintiff's building."

The court also stated that to the plaintiff's claim that "a resident and his family have relocated due to defendant's construction activity, and have also requested a rent abatement," such facts, "standing alone, does not constitute irreparable injury" and the alleged harms, "such as dust, debris, and water infiltration, if any, are compensable."

Thus, the court held that the plaintiff failed to establish irreparable harm and the plaintiff failed to demonstrate "on this record that the balance of equities weighs in its favor such that granting the drastic remedy of injunctive relief is warranted."

Beaux Arts II LLC v. East 44th St., LLC, Supreme Court, New York County, Case No. 152995/2025. Decided November 13, 2025. Saunders, J.

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION

CALENDAR FOR THE JANUARY TERM WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

2 P.M.
 18/1902 People v. Francisco De La Rosa
 24/4467 Wah Win Group v. 979 Second Avenue
 24/7845 V. Shelby v. Joshua K.
 24/2962(2) People of State of NY v. Richmond Capital
 25/685 Roque v. 240 Lincoln
 24/5627 People v. Christopher Twilley
 24/6436 Lyons v. Sigma Management
 24/5035 People v. Manuel Vega
 19/571 People v. Ronny Rocha
 25/1385(2) Fokoik v. Norsel Realities
 25/919 B., Daryl v. Sophia P.
 24/532 People v. Jamal Brown
 24/1643 Markman v. NY-Presbyterian
 22/1505 People v. Antoine Gee
 25/2827 Alvarado v. Local 1549 - N.Y.C.
 25/332 Frey v. Izkowitz
 25/486(3) Menkes v. Beth Abraham Health
 25/5014(3) Menkes v. Beth Abraham Health
 25/1478(3) Menkes v. Mount Sinai Health System
 24/6239 People v. Zion Holley
 23/066 People v. Derric McArn
 25/2077N Penske v. National Holding Corp.
 25/4033 Santacruz v. 58 Gerry St.

THURSDAY, JAN. 29

2 P.M.
 23/5807 People v. Marlon Cruz
 24/6673 Cui v. City of NY
 24/50 N., Naomi
 24/5234 Peerenboom v. Marvel Entertainment
 24/5719 Mosley v. RCPI Landmark Properties
 25/840 Lava Media v. Hart
 17/2061(1) People v. Lonzell Green
 22/5048(1) People v. Lonzell Green
 25/1400 Ellen's Stardust v. Sturm
 25/1750 Thor 138 N. v. Goldberg
 Weyrin Finkel
 25/890 W., Macfedden
 24/1107 Butler v. Marco Realty
 25/4593 Rubin v. Kahlon
 24/4192(3) Fernandez v. SUB 412
 22/5744 People v. Gregory Darby
 23/414 People v. William Bunch
 25/5032 Day v. Plumber's Shop & Associates
 24/7239(2) City of NY v. Way.com
 18/366 People v. Rene Rodriguez
 25/5804 NYCTL 2019-A Trust v. 196 East 7th Street
 19/5458 People v. Clinton Benjamin
 23/703 People v. Samuel Whatts
 24/3494N S.M., an Infant v. City of NY

CALENDAR FOR THE FEBRUARY TERM

TUESDAY, FEB. 3

2 P.M.
 23/3543 People v. Brian Brown
 22/794 Valerzo v. HP Jamsta
 Housing
 24/7683 K., Leonie
 25/1074 Deutsche Bank v. Roberts
 25/1066 Board of Managers v. 45 East 22nd St.
 24/5422 Rodriguez v. RXR Glen Isle
 24/1512 People v. Chad Gardner
 23/2624 People v. Jason Peguero
 24/7792(2) Gilbert v. Winston
 24/7910 Acevedo v. City of NY
 25/2812 T., Hayden
 22/4434 People v. Rafael Silva
 19/3755 People v. Joanny Vasquez
 24/7636 Massoumi v. Ganju
 24/7922 Barlotta v. A.O. Smith Water
 24/5183(2) Labby v. Cummings
 24/7629 1946Tremont1B v. Naval Realty
 25/3117(2) Sarmiento v. Method General Contractors
 23/3307 People v. Akeem Sharp
 23/960 People v. Johnny Marin
 24/6709N 237 East 20 v. SD Second Avenue

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 4

2 P.M.
 24/4936 People v. Ayana Clinton
 24/1167 Yemeni-American Association v. Alsade
 25/3960 A., Luisanny v. Jonathan C.
 24/6171 Volva v. Tully Construction Co.
 25/0095 Beach v. Touradj Capital Management
 25/875 Sebastianito v. Schermerhorn LLP
 24/2316(1) People v. Malachi Williams
 25/1158(1) People v. Malachi Williams
 24/6224 Kapiuts Servicing v. Suburban Waste Services
 24/3957 Batista v. Burgos
 25/1652 W., Rodney v. Uchechi C.
 23/4105 People v. Anthony Henry
 24/6962(2) Rego Park Lender v. Golan
 25/694 Hamilton v. Premier Home Health
 22/459 People v. Bryan Thompson
 25/2062 Kay v. Citibank
 24/4154 People v. Daryl Dean
 25/4231 Global Bank v. 43 Mott Realty
 25/5034 Rijo v. YYY 62nd Street
 22/5033 People v. Mauro Vivar
 25/2511N 3502 Partners v. MTA

THURSDAY, FEB. 5

2 P.M.
 24/5340 People v. Aldo Jorge Rodriguez
 25/5704 Arta v. F.D.S Associates
 24/832 D., Children
 25/1632 Morrissey v. Morrissey
 25/4325 Aberbach v. NYS Department of Corrections
 25/4941 Castle Village Owners v. Girardi
 22/651 People v. Talounzo O'Connor
 24/426 People v. Rolando Tavaréz
 25/4794 Colon v. City of NY
 25/669 JDS Construction v. Cooper Services
 25/1026 S., Laila
 19/112 People v. Brian Zwingman
 24/531 Friedman v. Garnet Wines
 24/2030 Cook v. NYC Housing Authority
 25/4360(2) North Flats LLC v. Belkin Burden Goldman
 23/1538 People v. Clayton Johnson
 24/6874 U.S. Bank v. Gordon
 23/459 People v. Shawn Marquis
 25/704 Lam Pearl Street v. Rinaldi
 24/1784 People v. Joseph R.
 25/5099N FORT CRE 2022-FL3 v. Kasacovich

TUESDAY, FEB. 10

2 P.M.
 25/1052 People v. Debra Graham
 24/4818 Lebedev v. Migdal

25/2303 B., Children
 24/4833 Saquicela-Villa v. City of NY
 23/5571 Deloren v. Sewell
 23/3802 People v. Jamar Newton
 20/298 People v. David Gonzalez
 24/6495 27-21 27th Street v. Kanta
 25/3691(1) Discover Property v. National Football League
 25/3200(1) Discover Property v. National Football League
 25/698 Mueller v. 2001 Marcus Avenue
 25/1845 G., Jesus
 23/3178(1) People v. Carlye Herring
 25/340 Cheng v. State of NY Division of Housing
 22/5833 People v. Carlos Reyes
 24/7336(2) De Castro v. West Farms
 24/7233 Academic Health v. Ahluwalia
 25/4188 Schiff v. Intersystem S&S Corp.
 24/2765 Ellis v. City of NY
 22/3361 People v. Wilfredo Gonzalez
 24/5210N Vera v. Kollo Demo

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 11

2 P.M.
 24/3904 People v. Shaquille White
 23/4921 Gomes v. Roux
 24/2169 M., Trinity
 24/7360 Cook v. Hudson River Park Trust
 25/5210 Lowman v. Consolidated Edison Company
 25/1582(3) Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP v. McLendon
 24/3160 People v. D. H.
 24/3688 People v. William Lee
 24/6457 NRD GP v. McCarthy
 23/4296 People v. Luis Parada
 25/2547 Glowatz v. City of NY
 25/502 S.A., Children
 25/7454 Island Consolidated v. Grassi & Co.
 25/2610 Veloso v. Scaturro Brothers, Inc.
 25/2313 People v. Jonathan Arzu
 24/4356(2) Kohli v. Tewari
 24/4765(2) Kohli v. Tewari
 25/4037 Altman v. NYC Department of Education
 24/4676 Atta, Inc. v. 450 W. 31st. Owners
 22/1295 People v. Rhan Francis
 25/57268 SJJ Renewable Energy v. REV LNG LLC

FRIDAY, FEB. 13

10 A.M.

21/4556 People v. Edgardo Perez
 25/3438 Fernandez v. 475 Building
 25/1027(1) C., Abdoulay
 25/4908 Margolies v. Margolies
 25/5353 M. V., an Infant v. NYC Housing Authority
 24/6940(3) Ekin v. Sherwood Residential Management
 18/4593 People v. Marc Irving
 19/3841 People v. Bruce Lezama
 25/1326(2) Travelers Casually v. Vale Canada
 25/516 Weinhardt v. NYC Transit Authority
 25/1006 G., Children
 23/6438 People v. Vincent Mitchell
 25/4991(1) HSBC Bank v. West Park
 25/4989(1) HSBC Bank v. West Park
 25/656 SKYY Group v. Foundation for A Smoke Free World
 24/2449 People v. Shawndelle Jones
 24/6464 Marks v. Cosmos Ventures
 24/4506 Shufford v. City of NY
 25/2228 Figueroa v. Empire Water Main & Sewer
 18/4928 People v. Juan Rosario
 25/2955N Bernstein v. Assaf

TUESDAY, FEB. 17

2 P.M.
 24/637 People v. Jonathan Cedeno
 25/2246 Fields v. Junius-Liberty Development
 24/3788(1) R., Danna
 24/6051 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties
 25/3074(2) Gray v. Nassau Life Insurance
 23/2786(1) People v. Leuris Morales
 23/2728(1) People v. Leuris Morales
 23/191 People v. Esteban Villaman Almonte
 25/870N May v. Gibbs
 25/1700 Scott & Scott v. Kaplan LLP
 23/3974(2) Anonymous v. Anonymous
 24/3263 Avison Young-NY v. 459 W 50 Street
 25/736 Hunold v. City of NY
 25/6044 Gopstein v. Vad
 19/1373 People v. Tyeek M.
 25/4742 Will of Lillean M. Reich
 24/5294 Lexington Insurance v. NY Marine
 24/6249 Stewart v. JMDH Real Estate
 25/7659 Miller v. State of NY
 23/2074 People v. Michael Martin
 25/3504 Josey v. NYC Department of Finance

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 18

2 P.M.
 21/2956 People v. Bernard Butts
 25/5058 Talbert v. Tynes
 25/4407 G., Jaloni
 25/1520 Lackenbauer v. 162 Fifth Avenue Associates
 24/6733(1) Pescales v. Pax Ventures
 25/2577(1) Pescales v. Pax Ventures
 23/4841 People v. Jeffrey Jones
 25/225 Shanghai Pearls & Gems v. Paul
 24/4649 Golden Ox Realty v. Board of Managers
 25/3016 Robles v. 53-65 Walton LLC
 22/3832(1) People v. Askia Yaw
 22/3428(1) People v. Askia Yaw
 25/1311 Gamma USA, Inc. v. Pavarini McGovern LLC
 24/7046 Calix v. Union Theological 24/436 People v. Jeremy Scott-Mason
 25/6713 Cardenas v. Walgreens
 25/4578 Strella v. 20 Bruckner, LLC
 25/4182(2) Grey v. LLC Development Owner
 20/1387 People v. Athanasios Ioannidis
 25/5926N King v. 8 Spruce (NY) Owner

THURSDAY, FEB. 19

2 P.M.
 25/296 People v. Kyesi Prophete
 25/3133 Lurie v. NYC Department of Education
 24/6089 R., Zion
 24/6539 Calle v. 686 Broadway Realty
 25/1741 Galloway v. Arthur Clinton Housing
 24/7063 Schutzman v. 19 E. 72nd Street
 25/2339(1) People v. Hakim A
 25/2340(1) People v. Hakim A
 25/2341(1) People v. Hakim A
 24/5012 S.T.A. Parking v. Federal Insurance
 25/4768 Southgate Owners Corp. v. Esposito

COURT NOTES

APPELLATE TERM

First Department

Filing Dates for the March Term

The March 2026 Term of the Court will commence on March 2, 2026.

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

The Clerk's Return, Record on Appeal, Appendices, Notice of Argument and Appellant's Briefs must be filed on or before January 7, 2025.

Respondent's Briefs must be filed on or before January 29, 2025.

Reply Briefs, if any, must be filed on or before February 6, 2026.

OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION

Division of E-Filing

OCA Invites Comments on E-Filing Program Deadline: Feb. 13

In preparation for its annual report on electronic filing (e-filing), which will be submitted to the Legislature, the Governor, and the Chief Judge, the New York State Office of Court Administration (OCA) invites public comments on the Unified Court System's e-filing program, (NYSCEF).

Attorneys, litigants, and other interested members of the public are encouraged to share observations and recommendations.

Comments may be submitted by:

Email: filingcomments@nycourts.gov
 or

Mail: Christopher Gibson, Director
 OCA Division of E-Filing

CALENDAR FOR THE MARCH TERM

The March 2026 Term will commence March 3, 2026. The Court will convene at 2:00 P.M. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, and at 10:00 A.M. on Fridays. Counsel who desire and are entitled to argument pursuant to Section 600.15(a) of the Court's rules but have commitments, including those of a religious nature, which will make them unavailable on particular dates during the term shall notify the Clerk in writing of such unavailable dates and reasons therefor, with copy to adversary, not later than 4 P.M. February 5, 2026. This information is essential at that time for consideration in preparation of the Day Calendars for the term. No change of calendar date can be made after the Day Calendars have been prepared.

Respondents' briefs are to be served and filed no later than February 4, 2026. Appellants' reply briefs are to be served and filed no later than February 13, 2026. The last day to file stipulations of argument and time requests for oral argument is February 5, 2026.

Cases are listed in alphabetical order, with civil cases appearing first.

Civil

24/978 Graham v. City of NY
 19/1433 People v. William Caruth
 25/1054 Henriquez v. City of NY
 24/6949 Healy v. Kruger
 25/1282 Hearn v. Abeken Apartments
 25/662 Staten v. City of NY
 25/1111 Joyous JD Limited v. Yolanda Management
 19/833(1) People v. Wesley Cooper
 25/2154N Contempo Acquisition v. Dawson
TUESDAY, FEB. 24
2 P.M.
 25/1448(1) People v. Angelo Torres
 25/1993 Cheng v. Caban
 24/2869(4) W.A., Children
 25/2008 Payano v. Al Nahshal
 24/7722(2) Molina v. Appula Management
 24/6569(1) PH-105 Realty v. Elyayan
 24/6281(1) PH-105 Realty v. Elyayan
 22/4349 People v. Jaquan Moore
 21/191 People v. Raul Deleon
 24/4152 Kohl v. Memorial Sloan Kettering
 24/6698 AS Helios LLC v. Chauhan
 24/7108 Westpoint Home v. Dormify, Inc.
 21/15 People v. Erica U.
 24/5770 Abrams v. Abrams
 18/2352 People v. Ashleigh Wade
 24/6492 Walker v. City of NY
 24/6858 O'Flaherty v. Colombo
 25/4417 Rothman v. Rothman
 23/191 People v. Esteban Villaman Almonte
 25/870N May v. Gibbs
WEDNESDAY, FEB. 25
2 P.M.
 24/806 People v. Jonathan Alfonso
 25/2861 Ighnau v. City of NY
 25/387 L., Esther v. Chaim L.
 23/4252 Wilmington Savings v. Brown
 25/2757 Serrano v. Athena Properties
 21/3431 People v. Barron Williams
 23/6819 People v. Anthony White
 24/7212(1) Fiordella v. 345 West 70th Tenants
 24/6421(1) Fiordella v. 345 West 70th Tenants
 25/4773 Matter of Wells Fargo Bank v. HBK Master Fund
 25/4075(2) SL 4000 Connecticut v. CBRE
 24/6289 De Perez v. Fordham
 24/4374 People v. Gino Sozio
 24/6308 Falcao v. MTA
 24/7071 HSBC Bank v. Keeling
 23/3935 People v. Christopher Harrison
 24/6452 Mazzucro v. Broadway 52nd
 25/699 Khan v. Khan
 19/4291 People v. Adelmir Oliva
 25/5270N Gurney-Goldman v. Solit Management
THURSDAY, FEB. 26
2 P.M.
 22/1264 People v. Tony Thames
 25/4700 Castillo v. Cannon Point South, Inc.
 24/7382 V., Liam
 25/4913 Nazario v. Bytedance Ltd.
 24/2550 Robinson v. Henderson
 25/860 10839 Associates v. Big Apple E Time LLC
 19/1981(1) People v. Bridgitte Ascencio
 24/1557 People v. Manuel Espinoza
 25/4354 Seaton v. Babad
 25/894 Tower v. Structure Tone
 23/3920 People v. Antonio Rodriguez
 24/6477 Ortiz v. Fitzgerald
 25/4260 E. M., an Infant v. Paulino
 24/2903 Trzuskot v. Johnson
 24/551 People v. Barron Spruill
 25/1478 Menkes v. Mount Sinai Health System
 24/6777 People v. Saint Robles
 25/2339(1) People v. Hakim A
 24/673(2) Stile v. C-Air Customhouse
 23/2039(2)N Stile v. C-Air Customhouse
 25/2132N Diamond Films v. TV Azteca

Office of Court Administration
 25 Beaver Street, Room 926
 New York, NY 10004

All comments must be received by February 13, 2026. Submissions will be posted on the Court System's website.

NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

Court To Hear Arguments in the Bronx in March

The Court will be hearing argument away from Court of Appeals Hall in Albany for its upcoming March 2026 Session.

On March 10, 11 and 12, the Court will hear argument at the Bronx Hall of Justice, 265 East 161 Street, Bronx, New York. Arguments will commence at 9:30AM. A live webcast of the argument may be accessed through the Court of Appeals website.

Deadline for Amicus Curiae Motions: February 2026 and March 2026 Sessions

The Court has calendared the appeals in *People v. Gaffney* (Luke J.) (APL 2025-00077), *People v. Curry* (Eugene) (APL 2025-00076), and *People v. Billups* (Ricky) (APL 2025-00108) for argument during its February 2026 Session. The Court has set a special deadline for motions seeking to participate as amicus curiae in these appeals. Motions for permission to file a brief amicus curiae in these appeals must be served no later than December 22, 2025 and noticed for a return date no later than January 5, 2026.

The Court has calendared the appeal in *Matter of Bi-Coastal Properties v. Soliman* (APL 2025-00136) for argument during its March 2026 Session. The Court has set a special deadline for motions seeking to participate as amicus curiae in this appeal. Motions for permission to file a brief amicus curiae in the Matter of Bi-Coastal Properties appeal must be served no later than January 27, 2026 and noticed for a return date no later than February 9, 2026.

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

25/477N Astraea NNYN v. Ganley (NY 650082/2021)
 25/5499 Atkins v. 3314 SAS Equity (BX 807198/2021)
 25/690 Aerialis Capital v. Hertz International (NY 654710/2021)
 25/3673 Aziz v. Hunts Point Terminal Produce (BX 24777/2016)
 25/5187 B., Andrew v. Allegra J. (NY 04120/2024)
 25/2272 B., Victoria (BX 29766/2024)
 24/4226 B.A. v. H.K. (BX 76049/2013)
 25/198 Bacsin v. Avon Products (NY 190069/2023)
 24/7595 Bailey v. Bailey (NY 310179/2008)
 25/1291 Bank of America v. Sands (NY 810068/2010)
 24/6531 Bank of NY Mellon v. Miller (NY 850163/2014)
 25/3467 Bank of NY Mellon v. Vitucci (BX 381246/2011)
 15/737/2020
 25/6359 Bautista v. 1650 Corp (NY 15737/2020)
 25/2964 Beauty Holdings v. Saks & Company (NY 650257/2022)
 24/479 Becker v. Hop Kee Restaurant (NY 152967/2018)
 25/523 Benhar v. 5 Star Legal Funding (NY 657390/2020)
 25/3023 BFAM Asian Opportunities v. Glory Health Industry (NY 651863/2023)
 23/6096N Bianculli v. City of NY Office Labor Relations (NY 160234/2022)
 24/5513 Bifulco v. City of NY (NY 161841/2023)
 25/3708 Blount v. Verizon, Spectrum (NY 158977/2023)
 24/7564 Blumenfeld v. Smith (NY 651069/2024)
 19/192 Blumenfeld v. Stable 49 (NY 157117/2017)
 24/7359 Board of Managers v. 56th and Park (NY 65561/2021)
 25/2843 Branch Banking & Trust v. Cootle (BX 32225/2015)
 25/206 Tridage and Tunnel Officers v. Bridgeburg Bridge & Tunnel (NY 652428/2024)
 24/6717 62 Wooster v. TML New York (NY 159314/2021)
 25/2828 Broadway PT 1710 v. Kingdom Associates (NY 159783/2024)
 24/4228 A., Messiah (BX 81659/2021)
 24/7265 A., Ola v. Bafode D. (NY 8732/2023)
 24/3351 A.D., Children (NY N50/2023)
 25/6294 AAEBS Fund v. Duval & Stachenfeld (NY 154345/2023)
 24/5959 ABJ 105 LLC v. Martinec (NY 650810/2023)
 25/7227 Abuhamdia v. NY Presbyterian (NY 100837/2025)
 25/3466N Ahdab v. NYC Housing Authority (BX 813171/2021)
 25/1839AIG Property Casualty v. High Line Construction (NY 158444/2018)
 25/6712 Air Products & Chemicals v. World Energy (NY 652646/2025)
 24/5602 Almodovar v. City of NY (NY 159535/2023)
 24/7703 Alston v. City of NY (BX 816709/2021)
 25/5636 Alter Domus (US) v. Lakeland Holdings (NY 651533/2025)
 25/5738 Alvarez v. North State Realty (NY 802581/2021)
 25/2027 Amancha v. 720-730 Fort Washington (NY 159285/2020)
 25/6984 Ambase Corporation v. 111 West 57th (NY 652301/2016)
 25/6099 Ambrose v. City University Construction (NY 162316/2019)
 25/315N Amsterdam 140 v. Fruitopia LLC (NY 650513/2024)
 25/3694 Anand v. Gyeby (BX 29650/2017)
 25/5030 Anderson v. Lubin (NY 655151/2023)
 25/275 Andrade v. 1203 E New York Ave (NY 154137/2022)
 25/7183 Anthony Partners LLC v. Mici (BX 813158/2024)
 24/6340 Antonetti v. Academy Studio (BX 26678/2020)
 25/3625 Aponte v. 298 East Village (BX 804102/2024)
 25/1642 Apple Bank v. Prime Rock Real Estate (NY 653140/2023)
 25/171 Arena Vantage v. Actionable Procs (NY 654396/2024)
 24/7653 ARK448 Doe v. Maryknoll (NY 950475/2021)
 25/477N Astraea NNYN v. Ganley (NY 650082/2021)
 25/5499 Atkins v. 3314 SAS Equity (BX 807198/2021)
 25/690 Aerialis Capital v. Hertz International (NY 654710/2021)
 25/3673 Aziz v. Hunts Point Terminal Produce (BX 24777/2016)
 25/5187 B., Andrew v. Allegra J. (NY 04120/2024)
 25/2272 B., Victoria (BX 29766/2024)
 24/4226 B.A. v. H.K. (BX 76049/2013)
 25/198 Bacsin v. Avon Products (NY 190069/2023)
 24/7595 Bailey v. Bailey (NY 310179/2008)
 25/1291 Bank of America v. Sands (NY 810068/2010)
 24/6531 Bank of NY Mellon v. Miller (NY 850163/2014)
 25/3467 Bank of NY Mellon v. Vitucci (BX 381246/2011)
 15/737/2020
 25/6359 Bautista v. 1650 Corp (NY 15737/2020)
 25/2964 Beauty Holdings v. Saks & Company (NY 650257/2022)
 24/479 Becker v. Hop Kee Restaurant (NY 152967/2018)
 25/523 Benhar v. 5 Star Legal Funding (NY 657390/2020)
 25/3023 BFAM Asian Opportunities v. Glory Health Industry (NY 651863/2023)
 23/6096N Bianculli v. City of NY Office Labor Relations (NY 160234/2022)
 24/5513 Bifulco v. City of NY (NY 161841/2023)
 25/3708 Blount v. Verizon, Spectrum (NY 158977/2023)
 24/7564 Blumenfeld v. Smith (NY 651069/2024)
 19/192 Blumenfeld v. Stable 49 (NY 157117/2017)
 24/7359 Board of Managers

25/2918 Rossi Marketing Group v. McGuigan (NY 65302/2024)
 25/1702 Roth v. US Tennis Association (NY 154048/2021)
 25/2478 Roth v. Velasquez (NY 805197/2018)
 25/2703 Royster v. City of NY (BX 26001/2016)
 25/2000 Rubin v. EFP Rotenberg LLP (NY 651825/2015)
 25/25723 S. Amy v. Sanjay S. (NY 11846/2021)
 24/2360 S. Antonio v. Rita S. (NY 154579/2016)
 25/3173 S. Aracinda v. Shawn P. (BX 102633/2025)
 25/6083 Salas v. NY Presbyterian Hospital (NY 805312/2016)
 24/6523 Sanches-Pesantez v. City of NY (NY 154634/2024)
 25/266 Santacruz v. 58 Gerry St. (BX 23434/2019)
 25/2972 Sasson v. Bridger Consulting Group (NY 654872/2024)
 25/488 Scaglia v. Haart (NY 365088/2022)
 25/1792N Schnur v. Balestriere (NY 160095/2018)
 25/5453 Scope Leasing v. Patrick (NY 652871/2024)
 25/570 Semon v. Pebble Corp. (NY 653380/2024)
 24/6502 Serrano v. Judlau Contracting (NY 156263/2019)
 25/942N Seymour v. Hovmanian (NY 154759/2016)
 25/2525 Seymour v. Hovmanian (NY 154579/2016)
 25/1829 Shehshaghech v. City of NY (NY 158793/2019)
 25/173 Sho-In v. Rivera (NY 656269/2016)
 25/4198 Shorehaven Homeowners v. Campbell (BX 815987/2023)
 25/4177 Silverman v. Pret a Manger (BX 811460/2024)
 25/3679 Singh v. EMV Contracting Corp. (BX 810094/2021)
 25/2868 Smith v. Consolidated Edison (BX 801687/2022)
 25/7627 Solei Chartered v. Breton Equity Company (NY 653094/2025)
 25/5929 Southey v. City University of NY (NY 160213/2024)
 24/6571 Speechio v. Starbucks Corporation (NY 161323/2018)
 25/2634 State Division of Human Rights v. Metrowireless 167 (BX 809843/2024)
 24/5909 Structure Tone v. Selective Way Insurance (NY 86694/2020)
 25/4906N Stuckey v. City of NY (BX 309691/2021)
 25/2664 Stumacher v. Medical Liability Mutual Ins. (NY 157477/2024)
 25/4372 Suozzo v. Charles Schwab & Co. (BX 5596/2024)
 25/2844 Sweeney v. Beck (BX 70046/2019)
 24/7941 T. Zaniya (NY D3783/2024)
 25/2125 T.B., Children (NY N9126/2022)
 25/3407 Tamm Consulting v. Cincinnati Insurance (BX 300124/2018)
 25/27N Tapinakis v. Pace University (NY 652902/2022)
 24/7224 Tartell v. Klein (NY 653837/2024)
 24/6438 Taylor v. City of New York (BX 811839/2024)
 25/2302 Tekton Builders v. 1232 Southern Blvd. (BX 22310/2017)
 25/5324 Teneyck v. Port Authority of NY & NJ (NY 152521/2019)
 25/1998 Then v. Meridian Realty (NY 450869/2019)
 25/481N Tinea v. Bogart (BX 801318/2020)
 25/672N T-Mobile USA v. Broadcom Inc (NY 654741/2025)
 24/5889 Torres v. Lenscrafters, Inc. (NY 152844/2021)
 25/2253 Travelers Indemnity v. Southwest Marine & General (BX 809292/2023)
 24/7246N TRB Acquisitions v. Yedig (NY 651160/2021)
 25/1734 Tribeca Lending v. Bartlett (NY 105275/2007)
 25/4739 Troia v. Loanstreet, Inc. (NY 150354/2024)
 25/3886 Trump v. Trump (NY 453299/2021)
 25/291 Turner v. Pride & Services (NY 151428/2019)
 25/1660 United States Fire Insurance v. Pallin (NY 655765/2023)
 25/2541 Uzain v. Everest Scaffolding (NY 450164/2020)
 25/58396 Urban v. Roman Catholic (NY 950359/2022)
 25/4337 V. O'Neal (BX 87112/2024)
 25/4979 Valerio v. Perez (BX 808881/2024)
 24/7202 Vargas v. ESKT Empire State Building (NY 155627/2016)
 24/7674 Velasquez v. Rinaldi Group (NY 159684/2018)
 25/1649 Velasquez v. Story Avenue Residential (BX 29377/2019)
 24/7387 Veloso v. City of NY (NY 158128/2020)
 25/1665 Veolia Energy North America v. Enwawe West Coast (NY 651265/2024)
 25/2605 Verdugo v. Smiley & Smiley (NY 500137/2009)
 24/6024 W. Ka mel (NY N7960/2020)
 25/2470 W. Pascal v. Carlos M. (NY 65047/2022)
 25/2275 W. Tiwana v. Darrish B. (NY 15222/2021)
 25/1213N Waddell v. City of NY (NY 158685/2021)
 24/6914 Wagnar v. 55 Tieman Owners (NY 158744/2019)
 25/4769 Wagnar v. Wagnar (NY 365018/2022)
 25/2981N Ward v. Northeast Truck Rental (BX 809980/2022)
 25/1037 Warneke v. Bronx Community Board 11 (BX 817899/2023)
 25/3862 Waverly Real Estate v. Perez (NY 650256/2024)
 25/7087 Webb v. Lyft Inc. (BX 812958/2021)
 24/5045 Wells v. Atlantic Garage (NY 154918/2018)
 25/6541 Wesco Insurance v. Nunez Dental (NY 155341/2021)
 25/581N Will of George Kaufman (NY 7112018)
 25/221 Williams v. Dia (BX 80255/2021)
 24/7539 Williams v. RKR Construction (NY 150936/2018)
 25/4926 Williams v. Williams (NY 151860/2024)
 25/874 Wilmington Savings Fund v. Obatusin (BX 808811/2022)
 25/2245 Wilmington Savings Fund v. Virgin (BX 381517/2010)
 25/5858 Wilson v. Archdiocese of NY (NY 950730/2021)
 25/7528 Worldwide Credit Co. v. Kirk (NY 654519/2024)
 25/5499(2) WPC Billboard Lender v. Bartkowski (NY 653700/2023)
 25/1999 Zapata v. Edwards (NY 160696/2020)
 25/3141 Zelmanovich v. Eastmore Owners (NY 650443/2022)
 25/2232 Zurich American Insurance v. 56th & Park (NY) (NY 160495/2022)

24/204 People v. Angel Rodriguez (BX 71764/2022)
 19/1160 People v. Anthony Steward (NY 1278/2015)
 24/5912 People v. Antoine Parker (BX 73918/2023)
 23/4354 People v. Antonio Robinson (BX 3171/2016)
 23/316 People v. Anzar Thompson (NY 1954/2021)
 24/6132 People v. Arthur Hernandez (BX 2157/2014)
 24/2360 S. Antonio v. Rita S. (NY 154579/2016)
 24/6234 People v. Babacrae Ndiaye (NY 72722/2023)
 24/5574 People v. Benventoy Fogler (NY 75342/2023)
 25/3282 People v. Benventoy Fogler (NY 72034/2024)
 24/2725 People v. Brandon Heeraman (BX 71997/2022)
 21/2274 People v. Carlos Gonzalez (BX 1069/2019)
 24/4948 People v. Carlos Medina (BX 158/2019)
 23/1107 People v. Charles Cherry (BX 860/2020)
 19/3941 People v. Charles Washington (BX 4179/1982)
 24/4569 People v. Christian Rojas (NY 73685/2023)
 17/942 People v. Christopher Collins (NY 2144/2015)
 24/919 People v. Christopher Macias (NY 70538/2022)
 24/5377 People v. Craig Ruggeri (NY 71234/2023)
 24/3699 People v. Crystal Hutson (NY 73288/2022)
 25/759 People v. Daniel Simms (BX 75413/2023)
 23/4849 People v. Darius Hastings (NY 3228/2018)
 23/3076 People v. Darnell Wynt (NY 2164/2019)
 25/5920 People v. Darrell Rhett (NY 75647/2022)
 20/4321 People v. Dashawn Wright (NY 2418/2018)
 21/4660 People v. Dashiem Greene aka Daedae (NY 2854/2019)
 25/4560 People v. David Sheard (BX 70158/2022)
 25/3445 People v. Davon Pleasant (BX 425/2021)
 25/2652 People v. Deizon Guithy (BX 74010/2023)
 22/3019 People v. Derwin Blanks (BX 527/2020)
 22/910 People v. Deshante Page (BX 7115/2023)
 22/4562 People v. Devante Gibson (NY 296/2021)
 20/1742 People v. Devon McNiell (BX 15102/018)
 25/1779 People v. Diamond Haggan (NY 74715/2024)
 19/4645 People v. Diane Hunt (NY 2907/2017)
 25/972 People v. Diondre Holman (BX 75322/2023)
 20/1782 People v. Edward Goldfaden (NY 728/2018)
 19/5378 People v. Efrain Martinez (BX 99057/2018)
 20/602 People v. Elcires Cruz (NY 2301/2017)
 22/1886 People v. Elijah Feldman (NY 548/2018)
 22/516 People v. Elio Puntiel Ruck (BX 1449/2019)
 24/3883 People v. Emejanu Marable (BX 73397/2022)
 24/913 People v. Eric Santiago (BX 70905/2023)
 22/3804 People v. Eugenia Pedraza Cespedes (NY 5803/2023)
 24/4962 People v. Fabian Brown (BX 71695/2023)
 22/5214 People v. Felipe Solar (BX 541/2003)
 19/1470 People v. Ferdinand Rivera (NY 3418/2016)
 24/5363 People v. Fransys Ramirez (BX 619/2021)
 24/6555 People v. Freddy M. Ortega (BX 71227/2023)
 17/2041 People v. Frederick Mendes (BX 2262/2011)
 24/1166 People v. Frederick White (BX 2875/2013)
 18/4740 People v. George Jones (NY 1577/17)
 19/1276 People v. Gregory Washington (NY 1661/2017)
 17/138 People v. Horace Coleman (BX 2859/2012)
 20/110 People v. Irving Talavera (NY 2989/2018)
 25/4445 People v. Isaiiah Sullivan (NY 72000/2024)
 25/4446 People v. Isaiiah Sullivan (NY 72357/2024)
 25/4444 People v. Isaiiah Sullivan (NY 73346/2024)
 24/3083 People v. Jabal Gordon (BX 7077/2021)
 24/4349 People v. Jamar Carr (BX 75208/2023)
 25/4618 People v. Jamie Sanchez (BX 74509/2022)
 18/291 People v. Jason Perez (NY 3961/2015)
 18/2619 People v. Jason Polanco (BX 382/2015)
 24/2529 People v. Jason Young (BX 8032/2020)
 18/4817 People v. Javid Dore (BX 2049/2013)
 20/101624 People v. Javier Benitez (BX 50477)
 24/8221 People v. Jawan Thomas (NY 70515/2022)
 16/1082 People v. Jeffrey Taylor (NY 5259/14)
 21/12571 People v. Jeffrey Flores (BX 1961/2019)
 24/6778 People v. Jeremy Grant (BX 7322/2023)
 25/921 People v. Jerry P. (BX 3740/2016)
 24/2558 People v. Jesse Joucoo (NY 2330/2018)
 24/4053 People v. Joe Laubriel (BX 986/1997)
 25/469 People v. Jose Cabrera (BX 1131/2021)
 24/4558 People v. Jose Prado (BX 336/2019)
 25/444 People v. Joshua Brooks (BX 74238/2023)
 20/3761 People v. Joshua Velez (BX 3130/2013)
 25/1192 People v. Josue Deleon (NY 72940/2024)
 20/2150 People v. Julio Cuevas (BX 1382019)
 23/512 People v. Kaliq Robinson (BX 70127/2022)
 23/1150 People v. Kameke Jones (BX 2488/2017)
 24/4527 People v. Karan Geist (NY 73296/2022)
 25/5817 People v. Kawan Hernandez (BX 4771/2009)
 21/2844 People v. Kenny Johnson (BX 820/2021)
 24/522 People v. Khalid Barrow (NY 70830/2022)
 23/3558 People v. Khalid Wisdom (NY 70678/2022)
 23/6275 People v. Khphran Campbell (BX 481/2020)
 24/172 People v. Kshawn Bowers (BX 74425/2022)
 19/1868 People v. Lawrence Dilione (NY 1616/2017)
 20/1083 People v. Leroy Burton (NY 125/18)
 19/379 People v. Linnel Odum (NY 361/2017)
 22/4810 People v. Luis Gonzalez (BX 72224/2022)
 22/4495 People v. Luis Padro-Rosario (BX 70294/2022)
 24/3391 People v. Luis R. Nevarez (BX 72404/2023)
 23/6658 People v. Marcus Jackson (BX 120/2020)
 23/5230 People v. Mario Cuello Guerrero (BX 1471/2021)
 24/6006 People v. Marlon Alvarez (BX 679/2020)
 25/2648 People v. Matthew Nicholas (BX 73555/2024)
 25/2649 People v. Matthew Nicholas (BX 70869/2025)
 20/1056 People v. Maurice Kinsey (BX 2463/2017)
 24/7271 People v. Michael Antoine (BX 72192/2022)

24/7100 People v. Michael Jones (NY 1007/2017)
 25/156 People v. Michael King (BX 70954/2024)
 20/1055 People v. Michael Mable (BX 2085/2019)
 22/274 People v. Michael Ross (BX 267/2018)
 25/2633 People v. Michael Ross (BX 267/2018)
 25/587 People v. Michael T. Jackson (BX 73164/2023)
 24/683 People v. Michelle Merritt (NY 71987/2022)
 23/2717 People v. Odalis Imbert (NY 405/2021)
 23/2007 People v. Odalis Imbert (NY 70102/2022)
 24/268 People v. Omar Key (BX 893/2020)
 24/484 People v. Peter Rodriguez (NY 1091/2016)
 23/2577 People v. Peterson Merant (NY 1058/2021)
 22/4568 People v. Rasheed Davis (NY 684/2021)
 18/1549 People v. Rasheed Davis (BX 99082/16)
 24/4249 People v. Rene Garcia (BX 71139/2023)
 22/3623 People v. Robert Fulladosa (NY 70939/2022)
 24/4560 People v. Roderick Smith (NY 70862/2022)
 23/4849 People v. Rolando Calderon (BX 705/2016)
 22/3543 People v. Russell Smith (BX 1304/16)
 23/6220 People v. Samba Sall (BX 7137/2023)
 22/5210 People v. Samuel Ocampos (BX 290/2021)
 18/1943 People v. Samy Martinez-Jaquez (NY 2850/2016)
 23/6689 People v. Sean Jennings (BX 72831/2022)
 23/4307 People v. Sean Santiful (BX 542/2021)
 24/1560 People v. Shakiem Brunson (NY 72546/2023)
 23/1967 People v. Shawn Soto (BX 73560/2022)
 25/7770 People v. Skiboky Stora (NY 71945/2024)
 25/5577 People v. Skiboky Stora (NY 71945/2024)
 22/3040 People v. Stephanie Rodriguez (BX 1205/2019)
 23/182 People v. Tarik Jenkins (BX 828/2021)
 23/393 People v. Tayquan Wilson (BX 225/2021)
 23/169 People v. Thomas Nicholas (NY 71672/2022)
 21/498 People v. Troy Harrell (NY 2566/2017)
 24/4043 People v. Tyee Fisher (BX 70375/2023)
 19/1859 People v. Tyler Alvarez (NY 962/18)
 25/1272 People v. Tyresse Minter (BX 71281/2023)
 24/5029 People v. Tyrreek Anderson (BX 71407/2023)
 22/2027 People v. Unique Woodfin (BX 1239/2016)
 25/139 People v. Victor Jimenez Cespedes (NY 75803/2023)
 24/2580 People v. Wilson Garcia (NY 73351/2022)
 22/4459 People v. Xavier Rivera (BX 613/2021)
 25/902 People v. Yanil Heredia Gomez (BX 70847/2022)
 19/4501 People v. Yonander Cuevas (BX 1163/2010)
 24/6760 People v. Yordani Urena (BX 70561/2023)
 23/6595 People v. Kevin Bentley (NY 72475/2022)
 20/399 People v. Alexandros Lorentzos (NY 4439/2016)
 18/1432 PEOPLE v. ELGIDIO LIND (BX 3399/2012)
 19/4466 People v. Franklin Quiles (NY 2863/2018)
 19/4657 People v. Heather Rosen (NY 3294/2017)
 20/103 People v. Jorge Pichardo (BX 989/2018)
 19/5331 People v. Loftus Letang (BX 2015/2017)
 19/3415 People v. Neil Rodney (BX 2249/15)

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

Renwick, P.J., Manzanet, Kapnick, Webber and Kern, JJ.
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
 10 A.M.
 655117/18 Padia v. Toha
 23842/20 Leonard v. 65 East Tremont Housing
 2 P.M.
 651086/24 Tsui v. Kaufman

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
 9:30 A.M.
 659317/24 Sotheby's International v. Waterbury

12 P.M.
 804430/25 Estevez v. Morales

MONDAY, FEB. 2
 10 A.M.
 654519/24 Worldwide Credit Co. v. Kirk

TUESDAY, FEB. 3
 9:30 A.M.
 813660/21 Soto v. 1465 Jesup Realty

FRIDAY, FEB. 6
 9:30 A.M.
 154421/23 Kuhnreich v. Paragon JV Prop III LLC

MONDAY, FEB. 10
 9 A.M.
 813245/22 Hernandez v. Sanchez

11 A.M.
 152516/25 Serie v. X.R. Happy Tour Inc.

1 P.M.
 21339/19 Mays v. Lend Lease (US)

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 11
 12 P.M.
 806515/24 Pedabga v. Nunez

FRIDAY, FEB. 13
 9:30 A.M.
 21790/20 De Jesus v. Action Carting Environmental

APPELLATE TERM
60 Centre Street Room 401
 10 A.M.
 Commencing with the January 2026 Term, all oral arguments at the Appellate Term, First Department will be in person. Counsel and pro se litigants also have the option to submit.

MONDAY, FEB. 2
James, P.J., Brigantti, Alpert, J.,
 20/07 Delta Realty Group v. Jin, Lifeng & Shi, Shuang Long 26/020 Rivera, Edwin v. Western Beef/Rosdale Inc.
 20/21 New Century v. Rickenbacker, Yena
 26/024 Cardenas, Jere v. Bridges, Keith; Bridges, Brenda
 26/025 Demianchuk, Fedor v. Nostrand Photo Lab
 26/027 Campbell, Colin G v. Bharak, Eyal

each and the disposition thereof as marked on the Room 130 Calendar. 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 NYSECF 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 card.
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.
COMOTION—Adjourned to Commercial Motion Part Calendar.
FINAL—Adjournment date is final

60 CENTRE STREET
Submissions Part WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
Submission
 1 101182/25 Abreu v. Dept. of Health - Vital Statistic in NYC
 2 101300/25 Davis v. Bowery Residents Committee
 3 101482/25 Mansour v. Duque
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
Submission
 1 100995/25 Campbell v. Bernat
 2 101419/25 Davis v. NYCTA
 3 100460/22 Genao v. Guanilo
 4 100519/25 Miss Elegant v. Dr. Arthur
 5 101018/25 Sanchez v. Ocasio
 6 101152/25 Takeda v. Pinero
 7 101252/25 Yatzilez v. NYC Mta Bridges And Tunnels
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
Submission
 1 101299/25 Samuels v. NYC Dept. of Health
 2 101332/25 Spiridis v. N.Y.C. Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene

Paperless Judicial Part WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
 159463/21 Abad v. Tishman Const. Corp. Et Al
 3 Cohen, J.: 208 (60 Centre)
 4 Kim: 308 (80 Centre)
 5 Kingo: 320 (80 Centre)
 6 King: 351 (60 Centre)
 7 Lebovits: 345 (60 Centre)
 8 Koller: 278 (80 Centre)
 9 Capitti: 375 (60 Centre)
 11 Frank: 412 (60 Centre)
 12 Stroth: 328 (80 Centre)
 13 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)
 14 Bluth: 432 (60 Centre)
 15 Johnson: 116 (60 Centre)
 17 Hagler: 335 (60 Centre)
 18 Tisch: 104 (71 Thomas)
 19 Sokoloff: 540 (60 Centre)
 20 Kaplan: 422 (60 Centre)
 21 Tsai: 280 (80 Centre)
 22 Chin: 136 (80 Centre)
 23 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)
 24 Katz: 325 (60 Centre)
 25 Marcus: 1254 (111 Centre)
 26 James: T- 438 (60 Centre)
 27 Dominguez: 289 (80 Centre)
 28 Tingling: 543 (60 Centre)
 29 Ramirez: 311 (71 Thomas)
 30 McMahon: Virtual (60 Centre)
 32 Kahn: 1127B (111 Centre)
 33 Rosado: 442 (60 Centre)
 34 Ramseur: 341 (60 Centre)
 35 Perry-Bond: 684 (111 Centre)
 36 Saunders: 205 (71 Thomas)
 37 Engoron: 418 (60 Centre)
 38 Crawford: 1166 (111 Centre)
 39 Clynes: 232 (60 Centre)
 41 Moyné: 327 (80 Centre)
 42 Morales-Mintora: 574 (111 Centre)
 43 Reed: 222 (60 Centre)
 44 Pearlman: 321 (60 Centre)
 45 Patel: 428 (60 Centre)
 46 Latin: 210 (71 Thomas)
 47 Goetz: 1021 (111 Centre)
 48 Masley: 242 (60 Centre)
 49 Chan: 252 (60 Centre)
 50 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)
 51 Headley: 122 (80 Centre)
 52 Sharp: 1045 (111 Centre)
 53 Barock: 238 (60 Centre)
 54 Scherer: 228 (60 Centre)
 55 d'Aughtine: 105 (71 Thomas)
 56 Kelly: 204 (71 Thomas)
 57 Kraus: 218 (60 Centre)
 58 Cohen: 205 (71 Thomas)
 60 Crane: 248 (60 Centre)
 61 Bannon: 232 (60 Centre)
 59 James, D.: 331 (60 Centre)
 62 Chesler: 1127A (111 Centre)
 65 Rec: 307 (80 Centre)
 66 MPPKahn: 1127B (111 Centre)
 67 MMPSP-1: 1127B (111 Centre)
 68 IDV Dawson: 1604 (100 Centre)

PART 40TR JUDICIAL MEDIATION
On Rotating Schedule:
 13 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)
 13 Adams 300 (60 Centre)
EARLY SETTLEMENT
 ESC 1 Vigilante 106(80 Centre)
 ESC 2 Wilkenfeld 106 (80 Centre)

SPECIAL REFEREES
60 Centre Street
 73R Santiago: Room 354
 75R Burzio: Room 240
 80R Edelman: Room 562
 82R Wohl: Room 501B
 83R Sambuco: Room 528
 84R Feinberg: Room 641
 88R LHO/REIS: Room 324

JHO/SPECIAL REFEREES
80 Centre Street
 81R Hewitt: Room 321
 87R Burke: Room 238
 89R Hoahng: Room 236

SPECIAL REFEREE
71 Thomas Street
Judicial Hearing Officers
 Part 91 Hon. C. Ramos
 Part 93 Hon. Marin

Supreme Court Motion Calendars Room 130, 9:30 A.M.
60 Centre Street
Supreme Court Motion Dispositions from Room 130
60 Centre Street
 659443/24 Lau v. Erganic Design LLC Et Al
 655937/25 Liao v. Wong
 653652/25 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al

101395/25 Matheson v. City Univ. of NY Et Al
 166463/25 McKeithan v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
 659799/24 MFI 2022-F10 LLC v. Hairston Woods Prop. 656199/25 Mid-Century Ins. Co. v. Mta Bus Co.
 152745/25 Mills v. Alexander
 156233/25 Miranda v. NYC Et Al
 156956/25 Mondello v. Vrt Ventures LLC Et Al
 653072/25 NY Quality Healthcare Corp. v. Activis Holdco U.S., Inc. Et Al
 653856/25 Pahrnad v. Durrani
 154981/25 Palacios v. Herc Rentals Inc. Et Al
 453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.
 654287/25 Perez v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Langston Condominium Et Al
 653848/25 Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey v. Francis
 166176/25 Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey v. Reyes
 155714/23 Premier Enterprise Co., Inc. Et Al
 161117/25 Ramirez v. Police Comm'r.
 655279/25 Raphael v. Sobo & Sobo
 160330/22 Rodrigues Valim v. Extell
 Hudson Waterfront LLC Et Al
 151667/22 Rosario v. NYC Et Al
 659384/25 Ryerson Hldg. Corp. Et Al
 160019/25 Sadik v. Morrison
 190024/24 Scheiner v. 3m Co. Et Al
 450517/20 Seggos v. Ancona
 850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
 651267/24 Sotheby's Financial Services California, Inc. v. Bighawk Beverages
 150580/20 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Hansrajie Gooman Et Al
 850438/25 Stormfield Capital Funding I v. 2647 B'way. Apts LLC Et Al
 162317/25 The Estate Agency LLC v. Bruno
 161465/25 The Legal Aid Society v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al
 152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
 655638/24 Tremont Electric Co., Inc. v. J. United Electrical Contracting Corp. Et Al
 850276/21 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Raymond Bouderau As Trustee of The Raymond Bouderau Revocable Trust Dated May 27 65345/25 Unite Here Local 25 v. Babbo LLC Et Al
 160662/25 Wagner v. NYS Office of Court Admin.
 153917/24 Williams v. NYC Et Al
 850278/24 Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Wilson
 152809/23 Yedid v. Yorkin
 161033/21 Yedid v. Sordik
 9512

15907221 Torello v. Morton Williams Supermarkets, Inc. Et Al
15736321 Travelers Excess And Surplus Lines Co. As Subrogee of Gbc Properties, Inc. And All Other Insureds Under Policy Number K1q-Cmb-0r60545-A-20 v. Signature Plumbing Specialties LLC
156484/19 Travelers Prop. v. Myrie
15678624 Valencia v. Carmel Partners Et Al
158385/25 Vararas v. 322 West 57th Owner LLC Et Al
157625/23 Vazquez v. American Girl Retail, Inc.
655712/25 Willdan Energy Solutions, Inc. v. NYCHA
653364/23 Xi Wu Hu v. 6120 Rtlly. LLC
155221/22 Zhiminaiela v. Terminal Fee Owner Lp 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
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
15111/21 Aguirre v. 635 Madison Fee Prop.

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

154907/16 Singh v. NYC

Part 2

Justice Lori S. Sattler
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3852
Room 212
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

254854/22 697 Fifth/2 E 55th St Tlc A Titleholder LLC & 697 Fifth/2 E 55th St Tlc B Mortgage Borrower LLC v. The Tax Commission of The City of New York
256912/1731 Retail One LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
653104/18 Long Island City Laundry v. Defina
652591/24 Miracle Security Inc. v. Stevens
155542/17 Ruiz Carreno v. Chelsea Leaf South Housing
655996/20 Union Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. 94-04 80St LLC Et Al
254829/18 Vornado Westbury Retail LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC

Motion

155542/17 Ruiz Carreno v. Chelsea Leaf South Housing
655996/20 Union Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. 94-04 80St LLC Et Al
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
240077/23 1201 B way. LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
258524/09 125 Vertical Parking v. Tax Comm.

206738/21 151 William Rtlly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
250278/20 205 East 10th St. Owners Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
206723/21 234 East 46th St. Prop. Owner LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
240114/24 4245 West 55th St. LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
261834/1932 Gramercy Park Owners Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263156/16373 381 Pas Associates v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263863/21 44 W 37 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
262847/15 466-470 West 150th St. LLC v. The Tax Comm.

262458/16 478 480 Central Park West v. The Tax Comm. of The 266066/21 667 Madison Ave. De LLC Co/Hartz Mountain Industries v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
240130/24 707-709 Lexington LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC And The Comm. of Finance of NYC
657016/21 80-82 Bowersy LLC v. Lin
251937/17 86th St. Tenants Corp. v. Tax Comm. of The
265017/18 Atlantic 30 Wall Tenant LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
252820/21 Brep III 653 Hotel LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
265482/23 Cats 1637 York Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
255408/18 Faith Ministries Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250457/19 Fowler Court Tenants, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
252996/18 Fraydan Enterprises v. Tax Comm. of The
263719/18 Macarthur Properties I LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
240036/22 Michael T. Cohen v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
251949/18 Old Glory Real Estate v. Tax Comm. of The
252826/21 Palmetto Hosp.ity of Manhattan III v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
266061/21 Tribeca Acquisition Rtlly Corp v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al

Motion

266738/21 151 William Rtlly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
266723/21 234 East 46th St. Prop. Owner LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
266066/21 667 Madison Ave. De LLC Co/Hartz Mountain Industries v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
266061/21 Tribeca Acquisition Rtlly Corp v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

651624/20 Zenentino v. Reda
654425/19 Rockefeller Univ. v. Aetna Casualty & Surety
151987/24 Taveras v. Taveras

Part 3

Justice Joel M. Cohen
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3287
Room 208
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

655279/25 Raphael v. Sobo & Sobo
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
656279/23 133 W52 St Hldgs. LLC Et Al v. Beekman Reim LLC Et Al
656934/21 Board of Mgrs. of The 443 Greenwich St. Condominium v. Sgn 443 Greenwich St. Owner LLC Et Al
659932/25 Everest Reins. Co. v. Pci Industries
652527/20 Hudson Ins. Co. v. NY Const.
651469/18 J.G. Jewry Pte. Ltd. v. Tjc Jewelry, Inc.

Motion

659932/25 Everest Reins. Co. v. Pci Industries
652527/20 Hudson Ins. Co. v. NY Const.
651469/18 J.G. Jewry Pte. Ltd. v. Tjc Jewelry, Inc.

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

160509/24 Cvo Advisors Pte. Ltd. Et Al v. Nguyen
659397/25 Merit Cr Acquisition, Inc. v. Sjc Dif III-N
659217/25 Stablis Lending v. Dhilon
656356/25 Valley Nat. Bank v. Smart Medical Solutions LLC Et Al

Motion

160509/24 Cvo Advisors Pte. Ltd. Et Al v. Nguyen
659397/25 Merit Cr Acquisition, Inc. v. Sjc Dif III-N
659217/25 Stablis Lending v. Dhilon
656356/25 Valley Nat. Bank v. Smart Medical Solutions LLC Et Al

Part 6

Justice Kathy J. King
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3312
Room 351
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

805388/19 Macchini v. Goncharov
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
805098/22 Agilin v. Bogdan
805141/22 Akilova v. Gavrilman M.D.
805064/25 Allen v. Amsterdam Nursing Home Corp. (1992)
805402/21 Berg v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805049/24 Bernis v. The New York Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805059/23 Bing v. Haber M.D.
805242/25 Boas v. Worth M.D.
805039/25 Brill v. Susan Turner
805028/25 Buckley v. Braverman Ivf & Reproductive Immunology Et Al
805069/25 Burrell v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805342/22 Caldwell v. Marwin M.D.
805202/23 Caramico v. Yu M.D.
805196/25 Cioppa v. Abrams M.D.
805289/24 Cruz v. New York Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805122/24 Dam v. Stella Llyayeva
805007/25 Darek v. Albert
805413/23 De Leon v. Choe D.D.S.
805197/25 Debetta v. Yasukevich M.D.
805253/23 Devas v. Chelnis M.D.
805004/25 Douglav v. Papadakis D.D.S.
805105/23 Eckland v. Horn Md
805165/24 Evans v. Robbins M.D.
805358/24 Fontlane-Howard v. Westbay
805152/25 Frost v. Ellozy
805198/25 Giles McNeil v. Nawabi M.D.
805107/24 Gilliatt v. Sabrina M.

805322/23 Golowenizait v. Rizvi M.D.
805244/25 Gordon v. Teprnc LLC Et Al
805192/22 Hernandez v. Nelson M.D.
805277/25 Jikaria v. Cruz D.C.
805379/21 Kuczynski v. Ellozy M.D.
805362/22 Lauria v. Mount Sinai Beth Israel Et Al
805416/23 Leonard v. O'Malley M.D.
805063/24 Lesse v. Mount Sinai Hosps. Group, Inc. Et Al
805016/24 Levy v. Biviano
805014/24 Logan v. Perez Md
805265/23 Minen v. Feit M.D.
805064/19 Moore v. Lenox Hill Hosp.
805424/16 Murphy v. NYU Langone Medical Center
805143/22 Nasir v. NY Univ. Hosp. Center Et Al
805176/25 Park v. Lin Dpt
805256/25 Pilot v. Freund M.D.
805159/22 Portelli v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805256/22 Pugh v. Duszka M.D.
805138/25 Robinson v. Aspen Dental Associates of NY
805266/25 Rodgers v. NYCH&HC Corp.
805147/20 Romano v. Stelzer
805124/22 Seltz v. Vascular Surgical Associates Pllc Et Al
805269/24 Sepe v. New York Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805094/25 Silverio v. Manhattan Oral Facial Surgery LLC
805097/25 So v. Lipson M.D.
805238/25 Soler v. Mount Sinai Morningside Et Al
805216/25 Sosa v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
805242/23 Steinfeld v. Kim M.D.
805221/19 Steven D. Doll v. Arena
805255/25 Sverdlow v. Brown N.P.
805231/25 Tarricone v. Caridi M.D.
805131/22 Taylor v. Moisa-Babii M.D.

805259/25 Tirado v. Arora M.D.
805110/25 Wang v. Gold M.D.
805112/20 Webber v. Mt. Sinai Beth Israel
805184/21 Winkler v. Short M.D.
805237/25 Yi v. Getsos Md
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
805325/24 Samanich v. Long Island Care Center Inc. Et Al

Part 7
Justice Gerald Lebovits
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3746
Courtroom 345
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
101182/25 Abreu v. Dept. of Health - Vital Statistic in NYC
151897/25 Calle v. Legacy Yards Tenant Lp Et Al
158136/24 Chavez Flores v. 211 West 84th St Owner LLC Et Al
850136/14 Emigrant Bank v. Rosabianca
154047/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. As Subrogee of One Boerum LLC v. Current Fire Protection, Inc.
160923/24 Gulfo v. Equities By Marcy LLC
163288/25 Harding v. 3612 B way. Partners LLC Et Al
653652/25 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Hyde
452384/25 Part Auth. of NY & New Jersey v. Francis
151244/24 Ramirez Donis v. 83 Warren Rtlly. LLC Et Al
651050/21 The Board of Mgrs. of The Seaport South Condominium v. Gobin
161047/24 Timber v. V.I.M. Stores

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
161957/25979 Second Ave. LLC v. Chao
160935/24 Chuquimarca v. NY Insulation, Inc. Et Al
154604/24 Clinton v. The NYCHA
150605/25 Daquielma Yaguachi v. 25 Water Owner
154289/22 Delaney v. Bfp Tower Co. LLC Et Al
157121/25 Foundation Bldg. Materials LLC v. Certified Carpenterly LLC Et Al
152894/24 M & A Const. Corp. v. Unitarian Church of All Souls
157223/20 Jackson v. Paris & Chaikin
652157/25 Jp Morgan Chase Bank v. Kavka
150378/23 Kay v. Hillstone Restaurant Group, Inc.
151377/25 Martinez Castillo v. Canam Hudson Valley Logistics Owner
156888/21 Nisanov v. Marbo Restaurant Inc Dba Yips Restaurant Et Al
153585/24 Oster v. Tiki Chicki LLC Et Al
653751/25 Prescott v. Alegria Operating LLC
654523/23 Propeco LLC Et Al v. Mt. Hawley Ins. Co.
157824/22 Puentes Valencia v. First Ave. Parking
156981/24 Rajwani v. Hyatt Corp. Et Al
151997/24 Tasma v. Friedman
153613/24 Villanueva v. NYCHA
101225/25 Yatzel v. NYC Meta Bridges And Tunnels

Motion
161957/25979 Second Ave. LLC v. Chao
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
150976/23 50 West St. Condominium Et Al v. Jdm Washington St. LLC
160375/24 Aig Prop. Casualty Co. v. Isseks Bros., Inc.
156296/25 Alarcon v. Csc 2045 Madison
166224/25 Audige v. Newyork Presbyterian Hosp. Columbia Univ. Irving Medical Center Et Al
166091/25 Avison Young - NY v. Centennial Properties Ny Inc. Et Al
650257/22 Beauty Hldgs. LLC v. Saks & Co. LLC Et Al

157762/24 Berger v. NYC
157505/24 Byrd v. Tao Group Hosp. ity Et Al
152275/25 Cassette v. 1524-1st Ave. Rtlly. Co. LLC Et Al
451563/25 Comm'r's. of The State Ins. Fund v. Delouis
159039/24 Conlon v. Advanced City Electric Corp. Et Al
654021/24 Corporate Collections LLC v. Willkie Farr & Gallagher Lp
159415/24 De Anchundia v. 501 W 147 LLC Et Al
157933/25 Diaz v. Bamj Midtown Assets LLC Et Al
650104/22 Fidelity Aud Deposit Co. of Maryland v. Smilovic
659469/25 Fora Financial Warehouse 2024 v. Fresh Start Staffing LLC Et Al
154100/16 Frank v. Morgans Hotel Group
655182/25 Franklin v. Riverbend Housing Co., Inc. Et Al
164567/25 Friedman v. Hiller
656146/18 Hong v. Savage
152324/25 Haney v. Northern Manhattan Equities II LLC Et Al
161047/25 Holder v. Tphgreenwich Owner
650151/24 Icon III v. Joonbug Prod. ions Inc., D/b/a Skynt Media LLC Et Al
150426/26 In The Matter of The General Assignment For The Benefit of The Creditors of Shenankeiothemschiburger LLC v. Morrison
160958/24 Jaffe v. Positive Workforce Coalition, Inc.
651188/25 Langman v. Privilege Underwriters Reciprocal Exch.
161707/25 Lux Builders, Inc. v. NYC Et Al
653797/25 M & D Fire Door Inc. v. Elysium Const., Inc.
160143/25 Muns v. Gw 307 29th St. LLC Et Al
159400/25 Perez v. 10 West 33rd St. LLC Et Al
160924/23 Portelli v. Verizon NY Inc. Et Al
156376/24 Reinoso v. Cyckman Crestview Rtlly. Et Al
154316/25 Richards Jr. v. North Presbyterian Church Aka North Presbyterian Lutheran Church
160448/24 Rimer v. St. Nicholas One Seven Five Associates
656558/25 Schulte Roth & Zabel Lp v. Springool Special Opportunities Fund Lp
161139/25 Smith v. Carver Bancorp, Inc. Et Al
655171/23 Spc Advisory Partners LLC v. Zapp Electric Vehicles Ltd. Et Al
165330/25 Sylvester Jr. v. 335 Madison Ave. LLC Et Al
161141/24 Tirado v. Key Food Stores Co-Operative, Inc.
158731/24 Vanhook v. NY Presbyterian - Weill-Cornell Medical Center
160508/24 Walker v. P.S. 002 Meyer London School Et Al
152606/24 Zelaya Flores v. A/r Retail LLC Et Al

Motion
157699/23 Aaron v. The Dorchester Towers Condominium Et Al
153491/24 Abreu v. Frank And Walter Eberhart L.P. No. 2
154558/20 Atlantic Specialty Ins. Co. A/s/o Ellman Capital Corp. v. Landmark Signs & Electrical Maint. Corp. Et Al
156717/19 Bateman v. Cohen Brothers Rtlly.
161258/20 Bergan v. Alexico Group
155846/23 Burgos v. 501 Family Rtlly. Corp. Et Al
162256/23 Catalan Aguilar v. Yee Tai Enterprises Corp. Et Al
160718/21 Corleone Ramosi v. Rcp-Est LLC Et Al
150602/24 Crawford v. 300 West 114th Owner
160722/23 Davis v. Esplanade Gardens Inc Et Al
152251/25 Doe v. Combs
157885/21 Duran Batista v. McDonald's Corp. Et Al
155289/23 Garcia v. 59 W. 10th St. Ld. Liability Co.
155923/24 Glenn v. 9gi Bar & Restaurant Inc.
154645/24 Herz v. Sa Hospitality Group
157631/22 Igllesia v. 2143 Acp LLC Et Al
155024/24 Juanarena Collantes v. Willow Owner LLC Et Al
157322/23 Knapp v. NY Convention Center Operating Corp. Et Al
151332/23 Kopenhaver v. 448-45 West 57 Associates LLC Et Al
159264/24 McClure v. NYCHA
155083/23 McKee v. 89 Murray St. Associates LLC Et Al
151590/23 McQuay v. Metro-North Commuter RR.
154043/23 N. v. NYCHA
152385/20 Connor v. Morgan Stanley Mortgage
152761/24 Perdomo v. Board of Mgrs. of Tht Condominium Et Al
156413/21 Perez v. Boston Properties
159960/23 Rangel Suarez v. NY Univ.
159820/23 Reyes-Ramirez v. Yee Tai Enterprises Corp. Et Al
159038/23 Riegel Hl v. Mip One Wall St. Acquisition LLC Et Al
152476/23 Rizzo Villalba v. Hudson 37 LLC Et Al
160051/22 Rodriguez De Bonifacio v. NYCHA Et Al
158451/21 Rolland Smith Individually And On Behalf of All Other Persons Similarly Situated Who Were Employed By Zocdoc, Inc., And Related Other Affiliated Entities v. Zocdoc Inc., And Related Other Affiliated Entities
156349/24 Santos v. Crosscity Const. Corp. Et Al
655006/23 Starr Indemnity & Liability Co. v. Zurich American Ins. Co. Et Al
154755/23 Stokely Davis v. Vornado Rtlly. Trust Et Al
153844/20 Torres v. Esrt Empire State Bldg.
155926/21 Waterman v. Msg Arena
155661/21 Weiss v. Astor Pl.
160233/22 Winther v. M.

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
651720/18 Berardelli v. Novo Law Firm Pc
100119/25 Garbellini v. Jurgaitis
157347/23 Queiroz Cantisano v. Westmore Owners Corp. Et Al
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al
Motion
159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650024/23 27-10 37th Ave. v. Lb Engineering
653591/24 Citibank v. Burns
158326/25 Five Star Advance LLC v. Leads Investments LLC. Et Al
453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius Xm Radio Inc.
650722/25 Red Mud Enterprises LLC Et Al v. McCarter & English Lp
101128/25 Richards v. NY Courts
152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

Motion
159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650024/23 27-10 37th Ave. v. Lb Engineering
653591/24 Citibank v. Burns
158326/25 Five Star Advance LLC v. Leads Investments LLC. Et Al
453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius Xm Radio Inc.
650722/25 Red Mud Enterprises LLC Et Al v. McCarter & English Lp
101128/25 Richards v. NY Courts
152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

Part 9
Justice Linda M. Capitti
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3848
Room 355
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
321763/23 Auerbach v. Chantra
365101/24 Carrano v. Niromand
300465/22 Joshua Pena Ramirez v. Lilian Paulina Palate Ordonez
320403/20 Kikanelidze v. Khanjaliashivli
365693/25 Labno v. Rogers
301894/24 Soter v. Berger
365101/24 Carrano v. Niromand
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
365145/23 Chen v. Chen
350059/19 Theofanous v. Theofanous
Motion
350059/19 Theofanous v. Theofanous
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
365228/25 Guevara v. Mekelburg
305131/16 Hendrych v. Hendrych
321604/25 Reyes v. Reyes

Motion
365228/25 Guevara v. Mekelburg
Part 11
Justice Lyle E. Frank
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3314
Room 412
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650024/23 27-10 37th Ave. v. Lb Engineering
653591/24 Citibank v. Burns
158326/25 Five Star Advance LLC v. Leads Investments LLC. Et Al
453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius Xm Radio Inc.
650722/25 Red Mud Enterprises LLC Et Al v. McCarter & English Lp
101128/25 Richards v. NY Courts
152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

Motion
159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650024/23 27-10 37th Ave. v. Lb Engineering
653591/24 Citibank v. Burns
158326/25 Five Star Advance LLC v. Leads Investments LLC. Et Al
453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius Xm Radio Inc.
650722/25 Red Mud Enterprises LLC Et Al v. McCarter & English Lp
101128/25 Richards v. NY Courts
152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
651720/18 Berardelli v. Novo Law Firm Pc
100119/25 Garbellini v. Jurgaitis
157347/23 Queiroz Cantisano v. Westmore Owners Corp. Et Al
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

Motion
159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650024/23 27-10 37th Ave. v. Lb Engineering
653591/24 Citibank v. Burns
158326/25 Five Star Advance LLC v. Leads Investments LLC. Et Al
453325/23 People of The State of NY v. Sirius Xm Radio Inc.
650722/25 Red Mud Enterprises LLC Et Al v. McCarter & English Lp
101128/25 Richards v. NY Courts
152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
101047/25 Warren v. Total Mgt. NYC LLC Et Al

Part 12
Justice Arlene P. Bluth
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3219
Room 432
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
800666/24 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc. Inc. By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Chart
850370/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mineur
152655/23 Board of Mgrs. of Towers on The Park Condominium v. Williams
85027/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Moon
850044/23 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Southworth
850244/23 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mauritz Nensen
850314/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Peterson
850265/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Taranto
650039/24 Liu v. 80 Varick St. Group Lp. Et Al
157594/24 NYCTL 1998-2 Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon As Collateral Agent And Custodian v. 329 E34 LLC Et Al
157754/19 NYCTL 2017-A Trust v. Gonzales
157160/22 NYCTL 2011-A Trust And Lxelle Rtlly. Llc Et Al
160276/24 Olympic Tower Condominium v. Sky 641 LLC Et Al

Motion
800666/24 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc. Inc. By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Chart
850370/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mineur
152655/23 Board of Mgrs. of Towers on The Park Condominium v. Williams
85027/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Moon
850044/23 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Southworth
850244/23 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mauritz Nensen
850314/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Peterson
850265/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Taranto
650039/24 Liu v. 80 Varick St. Group Lp. Et Al
157594/24 NYCTL 1998-2 Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon As Collateral Agent And Custodian v. 329 E34 LLC Et Al
157754/19 NYCTL 2017-A Trust v. Gonzales
157160/22 NYCTL 2011-A Trust And Lxelle Rtlly. Llc Et Al
160276/24 Olympic Tower Condominium v. Sky 641 LLC Et Al

Motion
800666/24 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc. Inc. By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Chart
850370/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mineur
152655/23 Board of Mgrs. of Towers on The Park Condominium v. Williams
85027/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Moon
850044/23 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Southworth
850244/23 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mauritz Nensen
850314/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Peterson
850265/24 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc. Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Taranto
650039/24 Liu v. 80 Varick St. Group Lp. Et Al
157594/24 NYCTL 1998-2 Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon As Collateral Agent And Custodian v. 329 E34 LLC Et Al
157754/19 NYCTL 2017-A Trust v. Gonzales
157160/22 NYCTL 2011-A Trust And Lxelle Rtlly. Llc Et Al
160276/24 Olympic Tower Condominium v. Sky 641 LLC Et Al

659091/25 Jurysta v. 254 Park Ave. South LLC
157168/25 Krips v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

159113/25501 Fifth Ave. Co. LLC v. Bello
659473/25 Ako Fiber & Excavating LLC v. Allstate Sales Group Inc Et Al
650950/23 Board of Mgrs. of 570 Broome Condominium v. Soho Broome Condos LLC Et Al
451549/25 Bklyn. Defender Services v. Records Access Officer
952327/23 Doe v. Roe
163470/25 Edwards v. Malave-Gonzalez
654982/25 Framan Mechanical, Inc. v. NYCHA
156843/24 Goodman v. Shvo
153426/25 Grace Rtlly. Group LLC v. 25 Minetta Owners Corp.
150424/26 In The Matter of The General Assignment For The Benefit of The Creditors of Shenxialong LLC v. Morrison
659132/25 Kasowitz Llp v. Jds Dev. Group Llc Et Al
650584/23 Lechky v. Nayar
659319/25 Margaret Chiang v. Owemanco S B way. Run Lp Et Al
655105/21 Pastor v. Premier Hldgs.
656252/21 Savinis v. Aaron Bollman And Co. Inc.
656366/25 Tewel v. Nrt Ny LLC D/b/a The Corcoran Group
655712/25 Willdan Energy Solutions, Inc. v. NYCHA

Motion
650950/23 Board of Mgrs. of 570 Broome Condominium v. Soho Broome Condos LLC Et Al
952327/23 Doe v. Roe
654982/25 Framan Mechanical, Inc. v. NYCHA
659319/25 Margaret Chiang v. Owemanco S B way. Run Lp Et Al
655105/21 Pastor v. Premier Hldgs.
656252/21 Savinis v. Aaron Bollman And Co. Inc.
656366/25 Tewel v. Nrt Ny LLC D/b/a The Corcoran Group
655712/25 Willdan Energy Solutions, Inc. v. NYCHA

Part 13
Justice Leslie A. Stroth
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3273
Room 232
WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
157699/23 Aaron v. The Dorchester Towers Condominium Et Al
153491/24 Abreu v. Frank And Walter Eberhart L.P. No. 2
154558/20 Atlantic Specialty Ins. Co. A/s/o Ellman Capital Corp. v. Landmark Signs & Electrical Maint. Corp. Et Al
156717/19 Bateman v. Cohen Brothers Rtlly.
161258/20 Bergan v. Alexico Group
155846/23 Burgos v. 501 Family Rtlly. Corp. Et Al
162256/23 Catalan Aguilar v. Yee Tai Enterprises Corp. Et Al
160718

157466/23 Legacy Organization, Inc., Et Al. v. Diana Georgia Et Al

655334/25 Missionary Sisters of The Sacred Heart v. Cabgram Developer LLC

158302/23 The Austin Schuster Group v. Extell Dev. Co. Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29

655885/25 Arepili Mvts v. Nonghyup Bank

654281/23 Ferrara v. Lenihan Jr. 654562/24 Judau Contracting Inc. v. Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP Et Al

651399/25 Macomb County Retiree Health Care Fund v. Msc Industrial Direct Co., Inc. Et Al

Motion

654281/23 Ferrara v. Lenihan Jr. FRIDAY, JAN. 30

654138/25 Riley Securities, Inc. v. Lotery.Com, Inc.

654052/23 Capitol Hill 505 Associates v. Capital Hotel Jv LLC

654449/25 Excelusmie Review LLC Et Al v. Reddy

152548/25 Island Intellectual Prop. LLC v. Td Ameritrade, Inc. (n/a/Ameritrade of New York, Inc.) Et Al

655424/24 Yajkin Trading Corp. v. Sves Go LLC Et Al

Motion

152548/25 Island Intellectual Prop. LLC v. Td Ameritrade, Inc. (n/a/Ameritrade of New York, Inc.) Et Al

Part 54 Commercial Div.

Justice Jennifer G. Schecter 60 Centre Street Phone 646-386-3362 Room 228

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

153793/15 Bison Capital Corp. v. Hulton & Williams

652901/20 Empire Apparel LLC v. One Step Up Apparel Group LLC

652032/21 Epac Technologies Ltd. v. InterForm S.A.

650006/24 Legg v. Gotlib

650799/24 MFI 2022, F110 LLC v. Hairston Woods Prop.

651388/24 Nexamp Capital v. Dimension Me I LLC Et Al

Motion

650006/24 Legg v. Gotlib THURSDAY, JAN. 29

653908/23 Beast Investments v. Celebrity Virtual Dining

651241/25 King Contracting Group NY Inc. v. Bober

Motion

653908/23 Beast Investments v. Celebrity Virtual Dining

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

655360/25 Frena Mediterranean v. Naon

656226/23 Gerassymenko v. Symbion Power Services U.S., Inc. Et Al

659734/24 Rojas v. C.P.S. Hdg. Aps Et Al

659420/24 Rose v. Jacobs

651145/24 Scarola Zubatov Schaffzin Pllc Et Al v. CapitalMarket Hldgs., Inc. Et Al

656857/21 Shatz v. Chertok

Motion

655360/25 Frena Mediterranean v. Naon

659420/24 Rose v. Jacobs

656857/21 Shatz v. Chertok

Part 57

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

950689/20 C. v. NYC

159315/19 Chabla Remache v. Aldad & Sons Rty., Inc.

950251/21 G. v. NYC

950027/20 R. v. NYC

950198/19 R. v. NYC

159440/20 Rivera v. Bop Nw LLC

950891/21 Simmons v. The NYCHA Et Al

153341/21 Williams v. 349-59 Lenox LLC Et Al

Motion

950689/20 C. v. NYC THURSDAY, JAN. 29

951063/21 Burns v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

951110/21 Cherry v. NYC Et Al

950367/20 Curran v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese

950753/20 D. v. Archdiocese of NY

950133/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY

950732/20 F. v. NYC

950545/21 M. v. NYC

950143/21 Miller v. NYC Et Al

653855/25 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Chetrit

655304/25 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Chetrit

650126/23 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Jcmc West 34 Mezz II LLC Et Al

652970/25 Silverman v. Rosenberg

Motion

652524/24 Bb Energy USA LLC v. Keyera Energy Inc

654165/24 Jefferies LLC v. Rubicon Technologies, Inc., As Successor in Interest To Founder Spac

653855/25 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Chetrit

655304/25 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Chetrit

650126/23 Penn Hotel Junior LLC v. Jcmc West 34 Mezz II LLC Et Al

Part 61 Commercial Div.

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

653256/24 Corazon Energy v. Nrg Business Marketing LLC

651882/23 Kalaman Metals v. Macquarie Futures USA

659195/25 Sklar v. Sklar

Motion

653256/24 Corazon Energy v. Nrg Business Marketing LLC

659195/25 Sklar v. Sklar THURSDAY, JAN. 29

651145/25 Ared Monad Terrace LLC v. Monad Terrace Investment LLC Et Al

653665/25 Cornerstone Wealth Group v. Barnes

161485/24 Garda Capital Partners Sarl Et Al v. Schonfeld Strategic Advisors LLC

651969/24 Lexington Ave. Hotel v. 525 Lexington Owner

652979/25 Lin v. Green Tree Chinese Restaurant, Inc. Et Al

659223/24 Urban Grid Hldgs. v. Bgfl Ug Hldgs. LLC Et Al

650698/20 Wind River Investments v. Murphy

Motion

651145/25 Ared Monad Terrace LLC v. Monad Terrace Investment LLC Et Al

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

653236/25 Blue Torch Capital Lp Et Al v. Kpmg Llp Et Al

656384/25 Brookfield Corp. v. Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corp.

Motion

656384/25 Brookfield Corp. v. Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corp.

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

113527/11 Ackereizen v. Metro. Transportation

150346/21 Almonte Abreu v. NYCHA

160238/20 Beitmirza v. NYCHA

155886/20 Bisono v. Pacheco

152631/20 Cisternino v. NYCHA

156593/19 Gomez Miele v. NYCHA

151242/19 Gordon v. NYCHA

150241/21 Jackson v. Anthony Moore

152651/19 Maes v. Manhattan And Bronx Surface

159418/18 Marseille v. NYCHA

153807/21 McCabe Velardi v. Metro. Transportation

151346/21 Rivera v. Dejesus

150319/21 Smiley v. NYCHA

452417/21 Tkach v. Mta Bus Co.

80 CENTRE STREET

Part 4

Justice Judy H. Kim 80 Centre Street Phone 646-386-3580 Room 308

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

156990/25 East 62nd St. Associates v. Vecilla

653359/25 36th Hy v. Five Stars Chef Consulting LLC Et Al

159463/21 Abad v. Tishman Const. Corp. Et Al

151352/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Celebrity Home Loans

152836/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Eugene Kitchen

659085/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Farrukhkhon

156808/25 Bik v. Unisource Data Services Inc. Et Al

653599/25 Bravo Mgt. LLC v. Kimble

157219/25 Cobb v. Unisource Data Services Inc. D/b/a The Hive Et Al

655347/25 Crum & Forster Specialty Ins. Co. v. Wilson Rty. Mgt. LLC Et Al

101300/25 Davis v. Bowery Residents Committee

452489/25 Drake v. NYCHA Et Al

650118/26 Ebf Hldgs. v. Dechofer

Court Calendars

153891/25 Essenfeld v. 635 Second Ave. Rly. Corp. C/o Expert Mgt. & Maint. Co. of Ny, LLC Et Al

150254/24 Ferguson Enterprises v. Peak Mechanical Solutions Inc. Et Al

155315/25 Fraser v. 1114 Sixth Ave. Owner

156380/25 Henglein v. Sciame Const.

155891/24 Jdss Prop. LLC D/b/a Jdss Prop. NY LLC v. Rosenblum

155858/24 Jdss Prop. LLC D/b/a Jdss Prop. NY LLC v. Rosenblum

157500/21 Maquilon v. Bpp St Owner LLC Et Al

151117/22 Montanez v. 222 East B'way Prop. Owner LLC Et Al

152162/25 Muhanna v. Webster II

156795/22 Murphy Marshall v. Hp Acp Housing Dev. Fund Co. Inc. Et Al

151384/22 Murray v. NYC Bike Share

150171/25 Myers v. Sandbar Concession, Inc. Et Al

158083/24 Noimany v. Boris Mechanical, Inc. Et Al

154098/24 Oppenheimer v. 239 E. 115th St. Housing Dev. Corp. Et Al

154803/25 Ortiz v. Hp Savoy Park II Housing Dev. Fund Co. Inc. (a Not-For-Profit Corp.) Et Al

161905/24 Ortiz-Morales v. Tremada 161 107th LLC Et Al

152573/23 Paulino v. Storage Const. Co. LLC Et Al

157640/20 Pwy McGiver v. NYC 153759/22 Pw Hldg. Corp. Including All of Its Subsidiaries And Affiliates, Including But Not Ltd. To Avis Budget, LLC, Avis Car Rental, LLC, Budget Car Rental, LLC, Budget Truck Rental, LLC, Payless Car Rental, Inc. And Zipcar, Inc. v. Integrated Specialty Asc LLC A/k/a Health Plus Surgery Center

101018/25 Sanchez v. Ocasio

156930/19 Gomez Miele v. NYCHA

151242/19 Gordon v. NYCHA

150241/21 Jackson v. Anthony Moore

161875/24 So. v. Bowery 88 LLC

155199/25 State Farm Indemnity Co. v. Antonio Perez Flores

101152/25 Takeda v. Pinero

158450/25 Tapia v. Velocity Clearing

150319/21 Smiley v. NYCHA

151925/23 Unitrin Safeguard Ins. Co. v. Jenkins

659386/24 Usc 325 Church LLC v. Partridge

157747/25 Westco Ins. Co. v. Pure20 LLC Et Al

161892/23 Westmoreland v. Wrc Consulting Services, Inc.

160436/21 Woodford v. Vornado Rly. Trust Et Al

152479/24 Yurick v. Lendlease (us) Const. Lmb Inc. Et Al

158644/24 Zamyatina v. Welcome Care, Inc.

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

655578/25 149th Street Realty Associates v. South Bronx Overall Economic Dev. Corp.

655332/20 Behndr Partners LLC v. Horizon Select LLC

655330/20 Behndr Partners LLC v. Pipilani

154625/25 Calender v. NYC Et Al

164551/25 Chaudhry v. Chaudhry

652457/25 Chi v. Ross Law Group

161938/25 Guzman v. 110 Greene Fee Owner Lp Et Al

157103/25 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Perez

654200/25 Lin v. Famous Sichuan NY Inc. Et Al

652891/25 Oakwood Business Funding LLC v. East Coast Deliveries Done Right, Inc. Et Al

656294/25 Quick USA, Inc. v. Hi.Dozo LLC D/b/a Hi.Dozo Et Al

659147/24 Standard Pump And Motor, Inc. v. Waterscape Resort II

158450/25 Tapia v. Velocity Clearing

156283/25 Tbf Financial v. Berglund

655897/25 The Law Office of Alexander Paykin v. Harel

159072/21 Torello v. Morton Williams Supermarkets, Inc. Et Al

Part 5 City Part

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28

160162/21 Biana Todorovic v. Roosevelt Island Operating Corp. Et. Ano.

151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan Motor Cars Inc.

156771/20 Cruz v. The George Units LLC

151910/21 Where The Heart Is LLC v. Newrex LLC D/b/a Shellpoint

THURSDAY, JAN. 29

152201/21 Admiral Indemnity Co. A/s/o 141 Fifth Ave. Condominium v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al

152196/21 Aig Prop. Casualty Co. A/s/o Jay D. Kranzler v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al

154802/20 Camas-Mendieta v. Urban Atelier Group

154981/25 Palacios v. Herc Rentals Us. Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29

156688/24 Campbell v. Velazquez Fintel

153824/25 Harney v. Ean Hldgs. LLC Et Al

154309/23 Harrigan-Brantley v. Wang

150774/24 Martin v. Layr LLC Et Al

153288/23 Shaw v. Dajbache

156041/19 Wilson v. Lambert

152584/23 Yajima v. Airport Service Corp Et Al

151470/24 Yang v. Garcia

FRIDAY, JAN. 30

158574/25 Ahktar v. Miller Transportation Mgt. Et Al

154383/23 Alleyne v. Port Auth. of Ny And New Jersey Et Al

164135/25 Amaro v. Burzine

159830/24 Anderson v. Akkaf

157201/21 Askew v. Mohamed

158461/23 Banyai v. Sheard

150853/24 Barry v. NYC Et Al

160446/19 Bautista v. Fernandez

158590/24 Beckman-Lee v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al

161607/23 Bennett v. Stone

155892/23 Birnbaum v. Jefferson Cab Corp. Et Al

161139/24 Brazli v. Gualtona

153790/24 Campbell v. Holland

150301/24 Castillo v. Adeunumi

155684/23 Cedeno v. Ramirez

153677/23 Choi v. Gordan

152870/23 Cooper v. Khan

159729/23 Croft v. Tharian

150083/22 Diaz Vargas v. Torres

154857/20 Eastney v. Vito

151268/24 Diance v. Cardona

156352/24 Francisco v. S2dd Express Delivery LLC Et Al

157373/25 Geico Casualty Co. As Subrogee of Tyrese James Daegnon Brown And Saquan Johnson v. Flash Recycling Corp. Et Al

153717/23 Giliberti v. Dixon

150818/22 Guzman v. Guzman

150515/23 Guzman v. Duluc

152815/24 Hargrove v. Bah

155027/23 Hazzard v. V & I Pizzeria & Restaurant D/b/a V & T Restaurant, Inc. Et Al

153557/20 Holliday v. Singh

153918/24 Jackson v. Xpress Rent A Car Et Al

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

LAWJOBS.COM

When results matter

#1 Global Legal Job Site

Ranked by Alexa

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

CITATIONS NY

ACCOUNTING CITATION
File No. 2018-2448/A
SURREGATE'S COURT -
BRONX COUNTY CITATION
THE PEOPLE OF
THE STATE OF NEW
YORK. By the Grace of God
Free and Independent, To:
Denise Fowler; Angela
Fowler; Gladys Fowler;
Marion Fowler; Michael
Fowler; Craig Fowler;
Ronald Fowler; David
Fowler; Estate of Walter C.
Wood; Attorney General of
the State of New York; and
ILKDFORD HARPER a/k/a
RUDOLPH HARPER, whose
whereabouts are unknown,
if living or dead, to their re-
spective heirs, legatees,
creditors in interest whose
names are unknown and
cannot be ascertained after
due diligence and The un-
known distributees, next of
kin and heirs at law of WAL-
TER E. HARPER a/k/a WAL-
TER EUGENE HARPER,
deceased, if living, or if
dead, to their respective
distributees, next of kin,
heirs at law, legatees, de-
visees, beneficiaries, fidu-
ciaries, assignees, creditors
or other successors in inter-
est, whose names and post
office addresses are un-
known and cannot be ascer-
tained after due diligence;
A Petition having been duly
filed by the Public Adminis-
trator of the County of
Bronx, having offices at 851
Grand Concourse, Room
336, Bronx, New York 10451;
YOU ARE HEREBY CITED
TO SHOW CAUSE by mak-
ing a virtual appearance be-
fore the Surrogate's Court of
the State of New York,
Bronx County, at 851 Grand
Concourse, Room 406,
Bronx, New York 10451 on
February 24, 2026 at 9:30
o'clock in the forenoon of
that day, why the Court
should not grant the follow-
ing relief: (1) that the ac-
count of the Public Adminis-
trator of the County of
Bronx, a summary of which
will be served therewith, as
Administrator of the Estate
of WALTER E. HARPER
a/k/a WALTER EUGENE
HARPER, deceased, who at
the time of his death was a
fiduciary, 6585 Broadway,
Bronx, NY, be judicially set-
tled; (2) that legal fees of
\$134,184.01 as listed in
Schedule C-1 of the account,
of which \$67,092.01 will be
paid upon the completion of
jurisdiction herein and the
remaining \$67,092.00 will be
paid upon the entry of a Decree
herein, to Rodman &
Campbell, P.C. as attorneys for
the Public Administrator be
allowed; (3) that the Adminis-
trator be allowed its statutory
charges calculated pursuant to
SCPA 106.3; (4) that the commis-
sions calculated pursuant to
SCPA 2307 and 1106 (1) & (2)
be allowed; (5) that, in the
absence of anyone appearing
and filing objections hereto,
the entire net estate be
paid to the Commissioner of
Finance for the benefit of the
decedent's unknown heirs; (6)
that, in the event objections
are filed herein, the Court
hold a hearing to establish
the identity of the decedent's
distributees and grant pur-
suant to SCPA 2225 if ap-
propriate; (8) that such other
and further relief as the
Court may deem just and
proper be granted. PLEASE
CONTACT THE COURT AT
(718) 618-2378 OR VIRTUAL-
BRONX@NYCOURTS.GOV FOR
INFORMATION ON HOW TO
APPEAR ON THE COURT'S
VIRTUAL PLATFORM.
HON. NELIDA MALAVE
GONZALEZ, Surrogate, JO-
HANNA O'BRIEN, Acting
Chief Clerk Dated, Attested
and Sealed, December 24,
2025 (Seal) Attorney for Peti-
tioners: RODMAN AND
CAMPBELL, P.C. Tel. No.
(718) 882-2681 Address of At-
torney: 1428 East Gun Hill
Road, Bronx, New York
10469 Email: info@rodman
campbellllaw.com or hwc@rod
mancampbellllaw.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 at-
torney-at-law appear for
you, and you or your attor-
ney may request a copy of
the full account from the pe-
titioner or petitioner's attor-
ney.
19124 j7-W j28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that an On-Premise
Restaurant Full Liquor Li-
cense, Application ID NA-
0370-25-131312 has been
applied for by The Terrace
@Baychester Inc d/b/a High-
lights Restaurant & Lounge
serving beer, wine, cider,
mead and liquor to be sold
at retail for on premises
consumption in a restaur-
ant, for the premises lo-
cated at 410 Amsterdam Ave
New York NY 10024-6254.
20067 j21-W j28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that license# NA-
0240-25-100689 for wine &
beer has been applied for
by the undersigned to sell
wine & beer at retail in a
restaurant under the ABC
law at 461 5th Ave NY, NY
10017, NY County for on-
premises consumption.
Bond#461 5th Ave, LLC 461
5th Ave New York NY 10017
20034 Jan21 w Jan28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that license# NA-
0370-25-139486 for liquor has
been applied for by the un-
dersigned to sell liquor at
retail in a tavern under the
ABC law at 10 Delancey St.
New York, NY 10002, NY
County for on-premises con-
sumption. 2Ton LLC 10 De-
lancey St New York, NY
10002 Jan28 w Feb4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of PLAC RIGHT THERAPEU-
TIC SERVICES, LCSW PLLC
Articles of Org. filed NY Sec.
of State (SSNY) 12/9/25. Of-
fice in Nassau Co. SSNY design.
Agent of LLC upon whom
process may be served.
SSNY shall mail copy of
process to The LLC 1111 Ful-
ton St Woodmere NY 11598.
Purpose: Any lawful activity.
19002 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of MATHIAS AL-
TWICKER ARCHITECT
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 2/19/25. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent of PLLC upon
whom process against it may
be served. SSNY shall mail
process to: The PLLC, c/o
Mathias Altwickler, 580 Main
St., Ste 474, NY, NY 10044.
Purpose: To practice the pro-
fession of Architecture.
19119 d31-W f4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of POSITANO PODIA-
TRY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed
with SSNY on 12/12/2025. Of-
fice location: New York
SSNY desig. as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
process to 519 EAST 72ND
ST., 203A, NEW YORK, NY
10021. Any lawful purpose.
19013 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of SUSAN S. PARK M.D.,
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 12/11/25. Office location:
NY County. Princ. office of
PLLC: 511 E 20th St., Apt.
10G, NY, NY 10010. SSNY
designated as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to the LLC, 220
5th Ave., Fl. 11, Rm. 2, NY,
NY 10001. Purpose: Medi-
cine. 18959 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of WENDY HEILBUT
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 12/09/25. Office location:
NY County. Princ. office of
PLLC: 435 E. 52nd St., Apt.
4B, NY, NY 10022. SSNY de-
signated as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to Corporation
Service Co., 80 State St., Al-
bany, NY 12207-2543. Pur-
pose: Legal services. 19044
Dec24 w Jan28

LIQUOR LICENSES

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that an On-Premise
Restaurant Full Liquor Li-
cense, Application ID NA-
0370-25-131312 has been
applied for by The Terrace
@Baychester Inc d/b/a High-
lights Restaurant & Lounge
serving beer, wine, cider,
mead and liquor to be sold
at retail for on premises
consumption in a restaur-
ant, for the premises lo-
cated at 410 Amsterdam Ave
New York NY 10024-6254.
20067 j21-W j28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that an On-Premises
Full Liquor License, Applica-
tion ID NA-0370-25-131312
has been applied for by The
Terrace @Baychester Inc d/b/a
Highlights Restaurant & Lounge
serving beer, wine, cider,
mead and liquor to be sold
at retail for on premises
consumption in a Bar/Tavern
for the premises located at
3447 Baychester Avenue
Bronx NY 10469. 20066
j21-W j28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that license# NA-
0240-25-100689 for wine &
beer has been applied for
by the undersigned to sell
wine & beer at retail in a
restaurant under the ABC
law at 461 5th Ave NY, NY
10017, NY County for on-
premises consumption.
Bond#461 5th Ave, LLC 461
5th Ave New York NY 10017
20034 Jan21 w Jan28

NOTICE IS HEREBY
given that license# NA-
0370-25-139486 for liquor has
been applied for by the un-
dersigned to sell liquor at
retail in a tavern under the
ABC law at 10 Delancey St.
New York, NY 10002, NY
County for on-premises con-
sumption. 2Ton LLC 10 De-
lancey St New York, NY
10002 Jan28 w Feb4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of ON PURPOSE MARRI-
AGE AND FAMILY THER-
APY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed
with SSNY on 12/15/2025. Of-
fice location: New York
SSNY desig. as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to the LLC at
the princ. office of the PLLC.
Purpose: Professional Engi-
neering. 19226 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of ELIZABETH GUSTAFSON
Psychology, PLLC Arts. of
Org. filed with Secy. of State
of NY (SSNY) on 1/5/2026. Of-
fice location: NY County.
SSNY designated as agent
upon whom process may be
served and shall mail copy
of process against PLLC to 115
Broadway, Suite 1007, New
York, NY 10010. Purpose: any
lawful act. J21 W F25
19951

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of M. MODABER NEUROLOGY
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
SSNY on 12/19/2025. Of-
fice Loc.: NASSAU Co.
SSNY desig. As agt. upon
whom process may be served.
SSNY shall mail process to:
The LLC, 83 Stratford N.,
Roslyn Heights, NY 11577.
Purpose: Medicine. 19197
w.o.

**WELCOMED WEEKENDS
VETERINARY PLLC.** Arts. of
Org. filed with the SSNY on
12/16/25. 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,
58 Sunny Hill Drive, East
Norwich, NY 11732. Pur-
pose: For the practice of the
profession of Licensed Clinical
Social Work. j14-W f18
19657

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of VALANT PATHS MENTAL
HEALTH COUNSELING
PLLC Filed with SSNY on
01/01/2026. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent for process
and shall mail to: 2515
BARNES AVE, BRONX, NY
10467. Purpose: MENTAL
HEALTH COUNSELING
20378 j28-W m4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of THE BAREFOOT
BALLET LLC Arts. of Org
filed with Secy. of State of
NY (SSNY) on 10/24/2025. Of-
fice location: NY County.
SSNY designated as agent
upon whom process may be
served and shall mail copy
of process against LLC to
200 Spring Street, Unit 11,
New York, NY 10012. Purpose:
any lawful act. 16713
D31 W F04

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of NOHAR BARNEA
DEVELOPMENT DESIGN
LLC Arts. of Org filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 11/28/2025. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent upon whom process
may be served and shall mail
copy of process against LLC
to R/A: Entity Protect Regis-
tered Agent Services LLC,
447 Broadway 2nd Fl #3000,
New York, NY 10013. Pur-
pose: any lawful act. 20336
J28 W M04

FOUNDATIONS

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF
Tatiana Piankova Founda-
tion. For the fiscal year
ended July 31, 2025 is avail-
able at its principal office lo-
cated at c/o DeGaetano &
Carr LLP 80 Business Park
Drive Suite 100, Armonk, NY
10504 for the inspection dur-
ing regular business hours
by any citizen who requests
it within 180 days hereof.
Principal Manager of the
Foundation is Pamela J.
Carr. Esq. j28
20310

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF
The Buck Family Founda-
tion. For the fiscal year
ended October 31, 2025 is
available at its principal of-
fice located at 81 Main
Street, Suite 207, White
Plains, NY 10601 for the in-
spection during regular busi-
ness hours by any citizen
who requests it within 180
days hereof. Principal Man-
ager of the Foundation is
Stephen Buck. j28
17888

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of ADM ENGINEERING,
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 12/23/25. Office location:
NY County. Princ. office of
PLLC: 1045 Park Ave., 10th
Fl., NY, NY 10028. SSNY de-
signated as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to the LLC at
the princ. office of the PLLC.
Purpose: Professional Engi-
neering. 19226 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of ON PURPOSE MARRI-
AGE AND FAMILY THER-
APY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed
with SSNY on 12/15/2025. Of-
fice location: New York
SSNY desig. as agent of PLLC
upon whom process against
it may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to 870 WEST 181ST
ST. APT 24, NEW YORK, NY
10033. Any lawful purpose.
19210 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of Elizabeth Gustafson
Psychology, PLLC Arts. of
Org. filed with Secy. of State
of NY (SSNY) on 1/5/2026. Of-
fice location: NY County.
SSNY designated as agent
upon whom process may be
served and shall mail copy
of process against PLLC to 115
Broadway, Suite 1007, New
York, NY 10010. Purpose: any
lawful act. J21 W F25
19951

**M. MODABER NEUROLOGY
PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with
SSNY on 12/19/2025. Of-
fice Loc.: NASSAU Co.
SSNY desig. As agt. upon
whom process may be served.
SSNY shall mail process to:
The LLC, 83 Stratford N.,
Roslyn Heights, NY 11577.
Purpose: Medicine. 19197
w.o.**

**WELCOMED WEEKENDS
VETERINARY PLLC.** Arts. of
Org. filed with the SSNY on
12/16/25. 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,
58 Sunny Hill Drive, East
Norwich, NY 11732. Pur-
pose: For the practice of the
profession of Licensed Clinical
Social Work. j14-W f18
19657

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of VALANT PATHS MENTAL
HEALTH COUNSELING
PLLC Filed with SSNY on
01/01/2026. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent for process
and shall mail to: 2515
BARNES AVE, BRONX, NY
10467. Purpose: MENTAL
HEALTH COUNSELING
20378 j28-W m4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

23 S PARK LLC. Filed with
SSNY on 09/10/2025. Office:
Nassau County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent for process &
shall mail to: 56 ALHAMBRA
RD, MASSAPEQUA, NY
11758. Purpose: Any Lawful
20408 j28-W m4

261 SACKETT, LLC. Filed
with SSNY on 01/16/2026. Of-
fice: Nassau County. SSNY
designated as agent for
process & shall mail to: 2631
MERRICK RD, STE 203,
BELLMORE, NY 11710. Pur-
pose: Any Lawful
20407 j28-W m4

DSZ BUILD LLC. Filed with
SSNY on 01/21/2026. Office:
Nassau County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent for process &
shall mail to: 527 QUEEN CT,
WESTBURY, NY 11590. Pur-
pose: Any Lawful
20405 j28-W m4

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of Amber Gatlin Art
LLC Arts. of Org filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 11/3/2025. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent upon whom process
may be served and shall mail
copy of process against LLC
to R/A: Entity Protect Regis-
tered Agent Services LLC,
447 Broadway 2nd Fl #3000,
New York, NY 10013. Pur-
pose: any lawful act. 20336
J28 W M04

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

BEDFORD 164 LLC filed
Arts. of Org. with the Sec'y
of State of NY (SSNY) on
11/18/2025. Office: Nassau
County. SSNY has been de-
signated as agent of the LLC
upon whom process against
it may be served and shall
mail process to: The LLC, 135
Woodhill Ln, Manhasset, NY
11030. Purpose: any lawful
act. 19237 d31-W f4

FANCHON REALTY 3 LLC
Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY
on 11/3/2025. Off. Loc. NEW
YORK Co. SSNY desig. As
agt. upon whom process may
be served. SSNY shall mail
process to: The LLC, 225 West
23rd St, New York, NY 10011.
General Purposes. d31-W f4
19196

MESEROLE 73 LLC filed
Arts. of Org. with the Sec'y
of State of NY (SSNY) on
11/18/2025. Office: Nassau
County. SSNY has been de-
signated as agent of the LLC
upon whom process against
it may be served and shall
mail process to: The LLC, 135
Woodhill Ln, Manhasset, NY
11030. Purpose: any lawful
act. 19238 d31-W f4

2291 REO LLC Articles of
Org. filed NY Sec. of State
(SSNY) 12/8/25. Office in Nas-
sau Co. SSNY design. Agent
of LLC upon whom process
may be served. SSNY shall
mail copy of process to C/O
Harry Zubli Esq 175 Great
Neck Rd Ste 403 Great Neck
NY 11021. Purpose: Any law-
ful activity 19001 Dec24 w Jan28

28ADAR 2 LLC Articles of
Org. filed NY Sec. of State
(SSNY) 12/16/25. Office in
Nassau Co. SSNY design.
Agent of LLC upon whom
process may be served. SSNY
shall mail copy of process to
The LLC 5 Cross-
walk Rd Great Neck, NY
11023. Purpose: Any lawful
activity. 19007 Dec24 w Jan28

**ACROPOLIS CONDO UNIT
LLC.** Filed 12/17/2025. Office:
New York Co. SSNY designat-
ed as agent for process &
shall mail to: MR BENJAMIN
KAUFMAN ESQ C/O WOLF
HALDENSTEIN ADLER
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 270
MADISON AVENUE, NEW
YORK, NY 10016. Purpose:
General. 19377 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of HIFIVE CREATIVE
LLC Arts. of Org filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 9/3/2025. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent upon whom process
may be served and shall mail
copy of process against LLC to
R/A: eResidentAgent, Inc.,
1 Rockefeller Plz, #1204, New
York, NY 10020. Purpose: any
lawful act. 19225 D31 W F04

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of PROGRESS BOOKS
LLC Arts. of Org filed with
Secy. of State of NY (SSNY)
on 12/4/2025. Office location:
NY County. SSNY designat-
ed as agent upon whom process
may be served and shall mail
copy of process against LLC to
R/A: eResidentAgent, Inc.,
1 Rockefeller Plz, #1204, New
York, NY 10020. Purpose: any
lawful act. 19742 D31 W F04

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of SPARK DIGITAL
CONSULTANTS LLC Arts. of
Org filed with Secy. of State
of NY (SSNY) on 8/4/2025. Of-
fice location: NY County.
SSNY designated as agent
upon whom process may be
served and shall mail copy
of process against LLC to 208 E
Broadway, Apt J806, New
York, NY 10002. Purpose: any
lawful act. 15008 D31 W F04

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of THE BAREFOOT
BALLET LLC Arts. of Org
filed with Secy. of State of
NY (SSNY) on 10/24/2025. Of-
fice location: NY County.
SSNY designated as agent
upon whom process may be
served and shall mail copy
of process against LLC to
200 Spring Street, Unit 11,
New York, NY 10012. Purpose:
any lawful act. 16713
D31 W F04

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of 6 Gemstone LLC Arts. of
Org. filed with NY Dept. of
State: 12/12/25. Office loca-
tion: NY County. Sec. of State
designated agent of LLC
upon whom process against
it may be served and shall
mail process to the principal
business address: 56 Wood-
land Dr., Brightwaters, NY
11718, Attn: Carl Adams,
regd. agent upon whom
process may be served. Pur-
pose: all lawful purposes.
19021 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF FORMATION
of SYB LOGISTICS LLC Arts
of Org. filed SSNY 10/20/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 282 11TH AVE 811,
NEW YORK, NY, 10001 Gen-
eral Purpose 18972
Dec24 w Jan28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

HEILO, LLC Arts of Org. filed
SSNY 12/8/2025 New York Co.
SSNY design agent for
process & shall mail to 161
WATER ST # 701, NEW
YORK, NY, 10038 General
Purpose 18985 Dec24 w Jan28

HIELO PRODUCTION, LLC
Arts of Org. filed SSNY
12/17/2025 New York Co.
SSNY design agent for
process & shall mail to 161
WATER ST # 701, NEW
YORK, NY, 10038 General
Purpose 19057 Dec24 w Jan28

HOUSE OF LIONESA LLC
Arts of Org. filed SSNY
11/13/2025 New York Co.
SSNY design agent for
process & shall mail to 41
STATE ST, # 112, ALBANY,
NY, 12207 General Purpose
18973 Dec24 w Jan28

KALA'S RED ROVER LLC
Arts of Org. filed SSNY
12/8/2025 New York Co. SSNY
design agent for process &
shall mail to 228 PARK AVE
S PMB 406816, NEW YORK,
NY, 10003 RA: PLATINUM
AGENT SERVICES LLC 99
WEST HAWTHORNE AVE
STE 408 VALLEY STREAM,
NY, 11580 General Purpose
18983 Dec24 w Jan28

**KATHY BROWN CONSULT-
ING LLC** Arts of Org. filed
SSNY 12/5/2025 New York Co.
SSNY design agent for
process & shall mail to 190
WAVERLY PL, 3E, NEW
YORK, NY, 10014 General
Purpose 19051 Dec24 w Jan28

KAYMO CAPITAL LLC Arts
of Org. filed SSNY 12/4/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 323 PARK AVE S,
NEW YORK, NY, 10010 Gen-
eral Purpose 18977 Dec24 w Jan28

**KITCHEN CABINET ADVI-
SORY LLC** Arts of Org. filed
SSNY 11/18/2025 New York
Co. SSNY design agent for
process & shall mail to 41
STATE ST, # 112, ALBANY,
NY, 12207 General Purpose
18969 Dec24 w Jan28

**LADY CHARLOTTE'S
SPANIELS, LLC** Articles of
Org. filed NY Sec. of State
(SSNY) 12/3/25. Office in Nas-
sau Co. SSNY design. Agent
of LLC upon whom process
may be served. SSNY shall
mail process to: Chris Catalano,
3563 Wadewa St, Scarsdale, NY
11783. Purpose: Any Lawful
Purpose. 19663 j14-W f18

MANUEL PHOTO LLC Arts
of Org. filed SSNY 11/7/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 135 DIVISION ST, 7B,
NEW YORK, NY, 10002 Gen-
eral Purpose 18968 Dec24 w Jan28

MERCER EIGHTH LLC Arts
of Org. filed SSNY 12/1/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 41 STATE ST, # 112,
ALBANY, NY, 12207 General
Purpose 18995 Dec24 w Jan28

MIKRAV HOLDINGS LLC
Articles of Org. filed NY Sec.
of State (SSNY) 12/10/25. Of-
fice in Nassau Co. SSNY de-
sign. Agent of LLC upon
whom process may be served.
SSNY shall mail copy of
process to The LLC 12 Sut-
ton Pl Lawrence NY 11569.
Purpose: Any lawful activity.
19005 Dec24 w Jan28

ROLLING BITES LLC Arts of
Org. filed SSNY 11/12/2025
Bronx Co. SSNY design agent
for process & shall mail to 41
STATE ST # 112, ALBANY,
NY, 12207 General Purpose
19047 Dec24 w Jan28

SAD GIRL NAILS LLC Arts
of Org. filed SSNY 11/10/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 41 STATE ST # 112,
ALBANY, NY, 12207 General
Purpose 18981 Dec24 w Jan28

SADO COLLECTIVE LLC
Arts of Org. filed SSNY
12/2/2025 New York Co. SSNY
design agent for process &
shall mail to 41 STATE ST, #
112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 Gen-
eral Purpose 18979 Dec24 w Jan28

**SHADOW CREATIVE MAR-
KETING, LLC** Arts of Org.
filed SSNY 12/8/2025 New
York Co. SSNY design agent
for process & shall mail to 99
WEST HAWTHORNE AVE, #
408, VALLEY STREAM, NY,
11580 General Purpose
18984 Dec24 w Jan28

SONCHINO LLC Arts of Org.
filed SSNY 12/11/2025 New
York Co. SSNY design agent
for process & shall mail to 41
STATE ST, # 112, ALBANY,
NY, 12207 General Purpose
19050 Dec24 w Jan28

SYB LOGISTICS LLC Arts of
Org. filed SSNY 10/20/2025
New York Co. SSNY design
agent for process & shall
mail to 282 11TH AVE 811,
NEW YORK, NY, 10001 Gen-
eral Purpose 18972
Dec24 w Jan28

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE OF COOPERATIVE APARTMENT SECURITY BY VIRTUE OF A DEFAULT BY VIRTUE OF DEFAULT in a security agreement filed on SEPTEMBER 10, 2008, with indebtedness due by NOVEMBER 01, 2038, by Ruben Azrak in accordance with its rights as holder of the security, HSBC Mortgage Corporation (USA), by Dovenmuehle Mortgage, Inc., as servicer for the loan, by its successors, assigns, designees, by Kim Carrino, auctioneer(s), will conduct a public sale of the security consisting of 282 shares of stock issued by Finch Apartment Corp., and all right title and interest in and to a proprietary lease in a building known as and by the street address 52 East 78th Street, Unit 7C, New York, NY 10075, with an estimated value of \$500,000.00, together with fixtures and articles of personal property now or hereafter affixed to or used in connection with said apartment on FEBRUARY 4, 2026 at 11:30 AM, at the New York County Courthouse on the portico, located at 60 Centre Street, New York, NY 10007; in satisfaction of an indebtedness in the original principal amount of \$291,200.00, on which there remains an unpaid principal balance of \$211,105.46 plus interest from MARCH 01, 2025, subject to open maintenance charges. Notice is hereby being given to Ruben Azrak that payment of the debt is due in full by January 19, 2026. Further, that if Ruben Azrak or any person(s) has a dispute of validity of the lien or amount claimed herein, it may be brought to proceeding under Lien Law, Section 201-a, within 10 days of the service of this notice. You are entitled to an accounting of the unpaid indebtedness secured by the property that we intend to sell. You may request an accounting by calling us at (585) 232-7400 Ext. 312. The secured party reserves the right to bid on the security interest, to set the minimum sale amount and to reject any and all bids. The secured party makes no warranties or representations. Each bidder must make his/her own inquiry regarding the apartment and any liens or debts in connection therewith. The sale is subject to the Terms of Sale, including a ten (10%) percent deposit by certified funds at the auction; balance due upon closing within thirty (30) days; the payment of all sums due to the cooperative corporation and any existing tenancy. The apartment will be sold AS IS, possession is to be obtained by purchaser(s). Dated: January 9, 2026 FEIN, SUCH & CRANE, LLP ATTORNEYS FOR SECURED CREDITOR, HSBC Mortgage Corporation (USA), 28 East Main Street, Suite 800 Rochester, NY 14614 (585) 232-7400 88519 19577 j14-w j28

NOTICE OF PUBLIC SALE OF A COOPERATIVE APARTMENT

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: by virtue of default under Loan Security Agreement, and other Security Documents executed to CITICORP MORTGAGE, INC., c/o Cenlar, FSB with an address of 425 Phillips Boulevard, Ewing, New Jersey and a phone number of (900) 223-6321, as Lender, the Auctioneer, will sell at public auction, with reserve, on February 24, 2026, located at the New York County Courthouse, Portico, 60 Centre Street, New York, NY 10007, commencing at 1:15 p.m. 488 shares of the capital stock of 349 EAST 49TH STREET TENANTS CORP. (a Cooperative Housing Corporation), arisen in the name of ARLEEN WEST, and all right, title and interest in a Proprietary Lease to APT. 2K, located at 349 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10017. The Debtor(s) are entitled to an accounting of the unpaid indebtedness secured by the above-referenced Shares of Stock and Proprietary Lease at no cost to the Debtor(s), which may be requested by calling Roach & Lin, P.C. at (516) 938-3100. Sale held to enforce rights of CITICORP MORTGAGE, INC., as Lender, who reserves the right to bid ten percent (10%) Bank/Certified check payable to the Escrowee, Roach & Lin, P.C., as attorneys for CITICORP MORTGAGE, INC. Balance due at closing within thirty (30) days. The Cooperative Apartments will be sold "AS IS", and possession is to be obtained by the purchaser(s). ROACH & LIN, P.C. (ESCROWEE) Attorneys for Secured Party CITICORP MORTGAGE, INC. 6851 Jericho Turnpike, Suite 185 Syosset, NY 11791 (516) 938-3100 j28-w j11

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. SHEENA CAMBAU, ET AL., Defendants). Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure entered on January 7, 2025, and a Decision + Order on Motion duly entered on December 11, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on March 2, 2026 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 141 Sunset Boulevard, Unit 1041, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1151 together an undivided 0.3987 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$49,446.67 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index 806085/2023E. Heidi Broumand, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004, Attorneys for Plaintiff 19578 j28-w j18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF NFMV SPV LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Cayman Islands (C.I.) on 10/02/25. 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. C.I. addr. of LLC: 71 Fort St., PO Box 500, Grand Cayman, C.I. KY1-1106. Cert. of Form. filed with Assistant Registrar of Limited Liability Companies, Ground Fl., Government Administration Bldg., 133 Elgin Ave., Grand Cayman, C.I. KY1-9000. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19039

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF NWH HOTEL MANAGEMENT LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/08/25. Princ. office of LLC: 1819 Wazee St., Denver, CO 80202. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: c/o CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Management company. Dec24 w Jan28 19035

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF RAVE HEROES LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/02/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 18954

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF RMC FUND B FN RES LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/22/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/22/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19046

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF RTST THOMPSON LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/02/25. Princ. office of LLC: 500 34th Ave., 39th Fl., NY 10110. 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: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19038

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Sunrise Greenhouse Construction LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 12/17/25. Office location: NY County. LLC registered in PA: 6/18/20. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and SSNY shall mail process to: Cogency Global Inc., 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. PA and principal business address: 1109 Simmottown Rd., Gap, PA 17527. Cert. of Reg. filed with PA Sec. of the Commonwealth, 302 N. Office Bldg., 401 North St., Harrisburg, PA 17120. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Dec24 w Jan28 19020

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF THE MANGO PEOPLE LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 11/20/25. Princ. office of LLC: 1279 Rt. 46, Ste. C202, Parsippany, NJ 07054. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o 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., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19031

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF NewEdge Wealth, LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 1/16/26. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 651 Waterfront Pl., Ste. 510, Pittsburgh, PA 15222. LLC formed in DE: 2/4/20. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and 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 Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Jan28 w Mar4 20314

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF BO COCOA BEACH LENDER LLC Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/16/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 12/10/2025. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 600 MAMARONECK AVENUE #400, HARRISON, NY, 10528. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS. Townsend Bldg. Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 19008 Dec24 w Jan28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF DH 9 CROSBY LLC Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/17/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 10/21/2025. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 22 LIBERTY STREET, NEW YORK, NY, 10005. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS. Townsend Bldg. Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 19010 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF TOWAGA LLC Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/10/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 11/20/2025. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 80 STATE STREET, ALBANY, NY, UNITED STATES, 12207-2543. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS. Townsend Bldg. Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 19011 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF NPFNY-2753-STATEN ISLAND, LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/10/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 11/20/2025. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 80 STATE STREET, ALBANY, NY, UNITED STATES, 12207-2543. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS. Townsend Bldg. Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 19012 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 1890 ADAMS HOUSE HOLDINGS LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/12/25. Office location: Nassau County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/18/24. Princ. office of LLC: 333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 900, Uniondale, NY 11553. 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: 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, Div. of Corps., John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 18949 Dec2 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF ARG ME19PCK-001, LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/24/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 01/16/19. Princ. office of LLC: 38 Washington Sq., Newport, RI 02840. 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, Div. of Corps., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19223 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF ARG WO19PCK-001, LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/09/18. Princ. office of LLC: 38 Washington Sq., Newport, RI 02840. 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, Div. of Corps., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19224 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF C&AI SoHo Holding LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/10/25. Princ. office of LLC: c/o 1384 Broadway, 7th Fl., NY, NY 10018. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC 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 of DE. Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19229 Dec31 w Feb4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Granite State Analytical Services, LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 343 W. Main St., Leola, PA 17540. LLC formed in NH: 6/16/05. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogency Global Inc., 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. NH addr. of LLC: 63 Pleasant St., Concord, NH 03301. Cert. of Form. filed with NH Sec. of State, 107 N Main St., Concord, NH 03301. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Dec31 w Feb4 19202

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF TWOSIX3 LLC. App. for auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/30/2025. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Wyoming (WY) on 6/9/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Firstbase Registered Agent Inc., 447 Broadway, 2nd Fl #187, New York, NY 10013. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State of WY. Herschler Building East, 122 West 25th St, Ste 101, Cheyenne, WY 82002. Purpose: any lawful activity. 19694 J14 WF18

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF AYA SERVICE I LLC Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/04/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 01/03/2023. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 1220 BROADWAY, STE 801A, NEW YORK, NY 10001. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS. Townsend Bldg. Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 19014 Dec24 w Jan28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

DPS REAL ESTATE STRATEGIES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/16/2026. 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, 1 Scotts Lane, South Salem, NY 10590. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20024 j21-w f25

JC GROUP AB LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/19/2026. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Christopher Glier, 3347 Elliott Blvd, Oceanside, NY 11572. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20025 j21-w f25

JDO LONG BEACH PROPERTIES, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/14/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail process to: 12 T. MARKS PL. MASSAPEQUA, NY 11758. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20043 j21-w f25

J & G MULTISERVICES NO. 1 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/11/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 59 W BURNSIDE AVE, BRONX, NY 10453. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20057 j21-w f25

LONG ISLAND STRENGTH LABS LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/25/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 90 BROAD ST 25TH FL, NEW YORK, NY 10004. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20032 j21-w f25

OKK HOLDINGS LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/01/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2834 1ST CHANL RD, SEAFORD, NY 11783. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20047 j21-w f25

OLD WORLD PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/06/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 136 CHERRY VALLEY AVE, WEST HEMPSTEAD, NY 11552. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20049 j21-w f25

OMG VENTURES, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 09/04/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 10 CUTTER MILL RD, STE 305, GREAT NECK, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20038 j21-w f25

PLAYPAVE LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/05/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 418 BROADWAY STE R, ALBANY, NY 12207. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20054 j21-w f25

PSSP TECHNOLOGIES LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/29/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1542 LAUREL HOLLOW RD, SYOSSET, NY 11791. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20046 j21-w f25

RESIDENT MUSIC GROUP LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/12/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 6 QUAIL RUN, OLD WESTBURY, NY 11568. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20042 j21-w f25

SEVENMOON 7 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/13/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 70 COLONY LANE, SYOSSET, NY 11791. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20041 j21-w f25

STEL CONSULTING LLC. Filed with SSNY on 10/12/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1 HELEN ST, GREENVALE, NY 11548. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20037 j21-w f25

TATTA/DECABIA FAMILY LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/31/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 10 SHERWOOD GATE, OYSTER BAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20050 j21-w f25

TAYCOL, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/12/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 48 DAVIS AVE, PORT WASHINGTON, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20033 j21-w f25

VERTEX RIDGE TRADING LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/19/2026. 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, 11 West Prospect Ave., 3rd Flr. Ste 16, Mount Vernon, NY 10550. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20023 j21-w f25

VIC PROPERTIES LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/18/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 416 WILSON BLVD, MINEOLA, NY 1501. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 20039 j21-w f25

166WANSER LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/05/2026. 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, 540 Madison Ave, 26th Floor, NY, NY 10022. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j7-w f11 19436

GLOBAL FRONTIER GROUP, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 12/29/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 811 Center Drive, North Baldwin, NY 11510. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 19432 j7-w f11

Michael Falkove LLC filed with SSNY 10/31/25. Off in Nassau Co. Process served to SSNY - desig. as agt. of LLC & mailed to the LLC, 105 Wynn Ct, Syosset, NY 11791. Any lawful purpose. 19672 Jan14 w Feb18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF DUPLO REGENCY, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/09/2026. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Dogwood, LLC, c/o EB Group CPAs, LLC, 510 Broadhollow Road, Suite 300, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 20013 j21-w f25

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF LJJ BUSINESS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/07/2026. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 419 Mineola Ave., Carle Place, NY 11514. Purpose: any lawful activities. 20014 j21-w f25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Our Town 68, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with New York Secy of State (SSNY) on 10/26. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 155 W. 68th St, Unit 2006, NY, NY 10023. Purpose: any lawful activity. 20028 j21-w f25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of The Sonali Studio LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/22/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Registered Agents Inc., 418 Broadway, Ste. R, Albany, NY 12207. Purpose: any lawful activities. 20022 j21-w f25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Tyrl Creative Media LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/12/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail process to: c/o Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Apt 1C, Bronx, NY 10462. Purpose: any lawful act. 19954 J21 W F25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 171 STONY HOLLOW LLC. Art. of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/07/26. Office in Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 400 ANCHOR AVE OCEANSIDE, NY, 11572. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 19664 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 2000 BROADWAY 5E LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 10/29/2025. Office location: New York. SSNY desig. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 600 MAMARONECK AVENUE #400, HARRISON, NY, 10528. Any lawful purpose. 19677 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF CLOVEBROOK LLC. Art. of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/27/25. Office in Westchester County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC, 28 CLOVEBROOK RD VALHALLA, NY, 10595. Purpose: Any lawful purpose 19663 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF FOUNDING GROUP LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 01/06/2026. Office location: New York. SSNY desig. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 31-33 2ND AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY, 10003. Any lawful purpose. 19675 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF LANYI HOLDINGS LLC. Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 09/19/25. Office in Westchester County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC, 289 ROUTE 100 SOMERS, NY, 10589. Purpose: Any lawful purpose 19665 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF LOPEZ SLATER DESIGN LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/23/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: c/o Altman, Sheinfield & Svagel, 200 Park Ave. South, Flr. 8, NY, NY 10003. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC at the princ. office of the LLC. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19667 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF MADISON ADMIN SERVICES LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/05/26. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 350 West 88th St., NY, NY 10024. 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. 19670 Jan14 w Feb18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

360 W 119 ST LLC. App. for Auth. filed with the SSNY on 12/12/25. Originally filed with the Secretary of State of New Jersey on 12/08/25. 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, 161 Western Drive, Short Hills, NJ 07787. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 18905 d24-w j28

APOLLO LANDMARK, LLC. App. for Auth. filed with the SSNY on 12/12/25. Originally filed with the Secretary of State of New Jersey on 12/08/25. 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, 161 Western Drive, Short Hills, NJ 07078. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 18904 d24-w j28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

PURIFY GROUP LLC. App. for Auth. filed with the SSNY on 12/16/25. Originally filed with the Secretary of State of Delaware on 08/20/24. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o 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, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19040 Dec24 w Jan28

686 PORT LLC, Appl for Auth filed with SSNY 12/17/25. Office location: Nassau County. LLC formed in DE 7/9/2020. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail process to: c/o The LLC, 21 Vanderventer Ave., Port Washington, NY, 11050. DE address of LLC is of Corporation Service Company, 251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, DE 19808. A copy of the Cert. of Form. on file with State of DE, Div. of Corp., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 19233 d31-w f4

7614 4TH LENDER LLC Authority filed SSNY 12/11/2025 Office: New York Co. formed DE 12/18/2017 exists 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801 SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 424 MADISON AVE 16TH FL, NEW YORK, NY, 10017 Cert of Regis Filed DE SOS 401 Federal St #4 Dover DE 19901 General Purpose 18999 Dec24 w Jan28

FARM HORSE, LLC Authority filed SSNY 12/1/2025 Office: New York Co. formed DE 11/15/2011 exists 555 E. LOOCKERMAN ST #320, Dover, DE 19801 SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 99 W. HAWTHORNE AVE # 408, VALLEY STREAM, NY, 11580 Cert of Regis Filed DE SOS 401 Federal St #4 Dover DE 19901 General Purpose 18998 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BLUE SPARTAN LLC, fictitious name BLUE SPARTAN RESTAURANT NEW YORK LLC. Application for authority filed with Secretary of State of NY (SSNY) on 02/29/2025. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in DE on 10/31/2024. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 100 SE 2nd St., Ste 2000, Miami, FL 33131. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful act or activity. 18482 D31 W F04

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF LINDBROOK PARTNERS, LLC. App. for Authority filed with SSNY on 10/10/2025. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in DE on 4/16/2025. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served & shall mail process to 1 Rockefeller Plaza, Ste 1204, New York, NY 10020. P/B/A: 2049 Century Park East, 1400, Los Angeles, CA 90067. DE address: 6013 Centre Rd, Suite 403S, Wilmington, DE 19806. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste 4, Dover,

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

APPPFABRIKAT LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 12/16/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 41 STATE ST. # 112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 19054

BADDIE BREAKS LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 11/10/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 41 STATE ST. # 112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 19055

BELMONTX LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 12/3/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 41 STATE ST. # 112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18976

BRAY LUXURY STRATEGIES LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 12/8/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 275 GREENWICH ST, APT 2A, NEW YORK, NY, 10007 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18990

BRIGHTSPARK CONSULTING LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 12/10/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 41 STATE ST. # 112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18997

BT3 EQUITIES LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 12/16/25. Office in Nassau Co. SSNY design. Agent of LLC upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to The LLC 5 Crosswood Rd Great Neck NY 11023. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19006

BUCH PHARMACEUTICAL GROUP LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 11/24/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 230 PARK AVE, NEW YORK, NY, 10169 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18993

CNC INVESTORS LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 12/4/2025 New York Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 389 EAST 89TH ST, 10F, NEW YORK, NY, 10128 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18992

COVENARA MANAGEMENT LLC Arts of Org. filed SSNY 11/11/2025 Bronx Co. SSNY design agent for process & shall mail to 41 STATE ST. # 112, ALBANY, NY, 12207 General Purpose Dec24 w Jan28 18966

PUTNAM SERVICING LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/12/2026. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Jennifer Pirozzi, 2464 Putnam Drive, East Meadow, NY 11554. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j14-W f18 19686

JAVI HOLDINGS LLC, a Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 10/23/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 40 Bucec Street, Suite 415, Syosset, NY 11791. Reg Agent, Chris Coiro, 330 Motor Parkway, Suite 300 Hauppauge, NY 11788. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j7-W f11 19437

MARSOI LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 11/26/25 with an existence date of 01/01/26. 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 158 West 29th Street, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. j7-W f11 19433

STUYTOWN ONE LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/05/2026. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Wen Biao Li, 1 Great Neck Rd, Ste 8, Great Neck, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j7-W f11 19438

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF BASS REAL ESTATE, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/15/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 19045

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF BCE FRANKLIN LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/05/2025. Office location: Nassau SSNY desg. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 19015

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF CAMILA HOLDING LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. 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: Holding of real estate. Dec24 w Jan28 18964

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF CONEY REMICA PROPERTY HOLDING, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/09/2025. Office location: New York SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 229 EAST 85TH STREET #1010, NEW YORK, NY 10028. Any lawful purpose. Dec24 w Jan28 19016

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF DRMEK, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to David Mekles, 67 Fairway Terrace, Norwood, NJ 07648. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19034

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF FPA PRODUCTIONS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/12/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. office of LLC: 630 9th Ave., Ste. 1409, NY, NY 10036. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 19029

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF JWB 211 WEST 84TH LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Wendy Balter, 2711 Ocean Dr, Apt. 1438, Hollywood, FL 33019. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 19033

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF LANDR LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/12/25. Office location: Nassau County. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 18951

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF NEWMARK LIVELIHOOD LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 19032

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF SUNNYSIDE IL DEVELOPER, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 18953

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF TALCOTT GARDENS DEVELOPER, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/01/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 18955

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF D&J GEISE HOLDINGS, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/24/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. office of LLC: 29 E. 10th St., Ste. 1, NY, NY 10003. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19232

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF GREENSTONE FAMILY OFFICE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/18/2025. Office location: New York SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 225 CHERRY STREET, APT 47L, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Any lawful purpose. Dec31 w Feb4 19208

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF PITKIN BC, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/24/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19230

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF ENDO EXO STUDIO LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/24/2025. 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 #10186, New York, NY 10003. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. J07 W F11 18730

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF OPPROS LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/10/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 21 Richard Ave, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: any lawful act. J07 W F11 19409

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF TR CREATIVE LAB LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/10/2025. Office location: Nassau SSNY desg. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 19018

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF JE 2024, NO. 1 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/11/2025. Office location: New York SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 110 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, APT 3F, NEW YORK, NY 10024. Any lawful purpose. Dec24 w Jan28 19017

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF 419 TAVO LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/15/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to R/A: Northwest Registered Agent LLC, 418 Broadway, Ste N, Albany, NY 12207. Purpose: any lawful act. J21 W F25 20068

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI FIVE, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19221

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI FOUR, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19219

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/10/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19214

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI ONE, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19215

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI THREE, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19218

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF VERY SIMILAR TAXI TWO, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/22/25. Office location: NY County. 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. Dec31 w Feb4 19217

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF AI Economics LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/02/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 90 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: any lawful act. J07 W F11 19423

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF EMBODIED BY ADIA LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/11/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 99 Wall Street #1598, New York, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful act. J07 W F11 19056

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF Luke Sample Golf, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/12/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 275 W 96th St, #8B, New York, NY 10025. Purpose: any lawful act. J14 W F18 19676

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF SOFABLE LG LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/10/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 115 Central Park West, Apt 6C1, New York, NY 10023. Purpose: any lawful act. J14 W F18 19568

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF TALCOTT GARDENS PRESERVATION CLASS B, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/01/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 18957

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF TALCOTT GARDENS PRESERVATION GP, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/01/25. Office location: NY County. Prnc. 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. Dec24 w Jan28 18956

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 88-90 LEXINGTON OWNER LLC. Filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/26/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/10/24. Prnc. office of LLC: Glacier Equities, 152 57th St., 10E, NY, NY 10019. 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: State of DE Corporate Services Bureau, 614 N Dupont Hwy, Ste. 210, Dover, DE 19901. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec24 w Jan28 18952

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF INVESTMENT HOLDINGS LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/19/2025. Office location: New York. LLC formed in DE on 06/17/2025. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 345 E 30TH ST, NEW YORK, NY 10016. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS, Townsend Bldg, Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. Dec31 w Feb4 19209

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 250 Water Street Owner LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of Delaware on 02/21/13. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 19 W 24 St, Fl. 12, NY, NY 10010. DE address of LLC: 108 W. 13th St, Ste 100, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. j21-W f25 20027

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 50 RIVERSIDE 7A LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/21/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 06/02/2024. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 51 East Ave, Norwalk, CT 06851. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State of CT loc: 165 Capitol Ave, Ste 1000, Hartford, CT 06106. Purpose: any lawful activities. j21-W f25 20019

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF JONATHAN PAINTING SERVICE, LLC. Application for authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/19/2025. Office loc: New York County. LLC formed in Connecticut (CT) on 6/23/2014. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 51 East Ave, Norwalk, CT 06851. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State of CT loc: 165 Capitol Ave, Ste 1000, Hartford, CT 06106. Purpose: any lawful activities. j21-W f25 20019

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BLANTYRE CAPITAL US LLC. Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/24/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/21/18. Prnc. office of LLC: 125 Park Ave., 25th Fl., Ste. 2507, NY, NY 10017. 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 Secy. of State of DE, Div. of Corps., John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., #4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Jan14 w Feb18 19637

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF DGI HOLDCO LLC. Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/05/26. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/14/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: c/o CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State of DE, Div. of Corps., John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Jan14 w Feb18 19637

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 11 MILLER LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/05/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 11 MILLER BLVD, SYOSSET, NY 11791. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20386

13 CHRISTINA ST, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/20/26. 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 5 Cherry Grove Ct., Valley Stream, NY 11581. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. j28-W m4 20362

145 LAWRENCE AVE, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/20/26. 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 5 Cherry Grove Ct., Valley Stream, NY 11581. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. j28-W m4 20362

193 POST AVE LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/04/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 193 POST AVE, WESTBURY, NY 11590. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20383

195 NORTHERN BLVD REALTY LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/07/26. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 358 KENRIDGE BLVD, LAWRENCE, NY 11559. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20401

ALIENSINC LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/10/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2045 HUGHES AVE, APT 4B, BRONX, NY 10377. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20376

AVETON LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/23/2026. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 33 NORTH TYSON AVE, STE 202, FLORAL PARK, NY 11001. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20370

BF MARKETING LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/12/2026. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 99 UNIVERSITY PL., 204, NY, NY 10168. DE address of LLC: CGI, 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Jan14 w Feb18 19690

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF JBG SMITH Management Services, LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 12/11/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in DE: 2/23/17. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogency Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. DE address of LLC: CGI, 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Jan14 w Feb18 19693

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF LONGCHAMP PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/18/2025. Office location: Nassau. LLC formed in NJ on 09/19/2023. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 238 EAST MEADOW AVE, EAST MEADOW, NY 11554. Arts. of Org. filed with NJ SOS, PO Box 450, Trenton, NJ 08646. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec31 w Feb4 19206

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

428 APS REALTY LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 12/16/25. 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, 505 Northern Boulevard, Suite 214, Great Neck, NY 11021. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 18908 d24-W j28

41-07 CRESCENT ST JV LLC. App. for Auth. filed with the SSNY on 03/26/14. Originally filed with the Secretary of State of Delaware on 02/21/13. 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, 80 6th Ave, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 19026 d24-W j28

91 POWERHOUSE 26 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/20/25. 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, 330 E 75th St Apt 35B, New York, NY 10021. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 18902 d24-W j28

A&C 2400 RYER AVENUE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/24/25. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2400 RYER AVENUE, BRONX, NY 10458. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 18903 d24-W j28

TOSCANO TRAVEL LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/08/25. 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, 115 Northgate Dr, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. d24-W j28 18909

1831 Wood Avenue Property LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 12/30/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 1831 Wood Ave, Bronx NY 10460. Purpose: to engage in any lawful act. d31-W f4 19231

BANLA LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 12/29/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Brendan Banks, 66 Jerome Ave, Mineola, NY 11501. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. d31-W f4 19227

BEDFORD 162 LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/18/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 135 Woodhill Ln, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: any lawful act. d31-W f4 19236

11 MILLER LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/05/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 11 MILLER BLVD, SYOSSET, NY 11791. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20386

13 CHRISTINA ST, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/20/26. 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 5 Cherry Grove Ct., Valley Stream, NY 11581. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. j28-W m4 20362

145 LAWRENCE AVE, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/20/26. 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 5 Cherry Grove Ct., Valley Stream, NY 11581. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. j28-W m4 20362

193 POST AVE LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/04/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 193 POST AVE, WESTBURY, NY 11590. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20383

195 NORTHERN BLVD REALTY LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/07/26. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 358 KENRIDGE BLVD, LAWRENCE, NY 11559. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20401

ALIENSINC LLC. Filed with SSNY on 12/10/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2045 HUGHES AVE, APT 4B, BRONX, NY 10377. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20376

AVETON LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/23/2026. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 33 NORTH TYSON AVE, STE 202, FLORAL PARK, NY 11001. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. j28-W m4 20370

BF MARKETING LLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/12/2026. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 99 UNIVERSITY PL., 204, NY, NY 10168. DE address of LLC: CGI, 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. Jan14 w Feb18 19690

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF LONGCHAMP PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 12/18/2025. Office location: Nassau. LLC formed in NJ on 09/19/2023. SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 238 EAST MEADOW AVE, EAST MEADOW, NY 11554. Arts. of Org. filed with NJ SOS, PO Box 450, Trenton, NJ 08646. Purpose: Any lawful activity. Dec31 w Feb4 19206

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

LAW OFFICES OF PATRICK DI LUGGIO PLLC. Filed with SSNY on 01/21/2026. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated

Court Calendars

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Match Day Sports Apparel LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/06/2025. Office location: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 27 3rd Avenue, Fl 2, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: any lawful act. 20340 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MC Studio Jewelry LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/2/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 199 Chrystie Street, Apt 4S, New York, NY 10002. Purpose: any lawful act. 20338 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of PATRICIA EQUESTRIAN STABLES LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/6/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 180 Broome Street, Apt 1712, New York, NY 10002. Purpose: any lawful act. 20335 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of SADA STUDIOS LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/8/2026. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 750 Lexington Avenue, 9th floor, New York, NY 10022. Purpose: any lawful act. 20284 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of THE PAIGE GROUP LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/3/2026. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 52nd Street, Apt 3E, New York, NY 10019. Purpose: any lawful act. 20065 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Two for the Preiss of One LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/3/2026. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 535 W 52nd Street, Apt 3E, New York, NY 10019. Purpose: any lawful act. 20339 J28 W M04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 5601 INDEPENDENCE LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/19/2025. Office location: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 5601 Independence Ave., Bronx, NY 10471. Purpose: any lawful activities. 20409 J28 W M4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of PS EP 25 LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 1/7/26. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 902 Carnegie Center Blvd., Ste. 520, Princeton, NJ 08540. LLC formed in DE: 10/14/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeny Global Inc., 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. DE addr. of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 19691 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of RESTORATION DOCTOR, LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/17/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Florida (FL) on 1/30/17. Princ. office of LLC: 10400 NW 53rd St., Unit 100, Sunrise, FL 33351. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Davidoff Hatcher & Citron LLP, 605 Third Ave., NY, NY 10158. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State of the State of FL, FL Dept. of State, Div. of Corps., P.O. Box 6000, Tallahassee, FL 32314-0600. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19639 Jan14 w Feb18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of SoHo Retail Portfolio 113 Sproul Street LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/05/26. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/31/25. Princ. office of LLC: 233 S. Wacker Dr., Ste. 4700, Chicago, IL 60606. 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: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Name/addr. of genl. ptr. available from NY Sec. of State. Cert. of LP filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 19669 Jan14 w Feb18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF BO RENT MEZZANINE LENDER LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 01/23/2026. Office location: NEW YORK. LLC formed in DE on 02/22/2026. SSNY desig. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 600 MAMARONECK AVENUE, #400, HARRISON, NY, UNITED STATES, 10528. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS, 401 Federal St., Ste. 3 Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 20341 Jan28 w Mar4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Penny Linn - Manhattan LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 12/16/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 450 W. 14th St., NY, NY 10014. LLC formed in DE: 12/11/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeny Global Inc., 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168, regd. agent upon whom process may be served. DE addr. of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 19382 Jan7 w Feb11

NOTICE OF QUAL. OF BO RENT MEZZANINE LENDER LLC. Auth. filed with SSNY on 01/23/2026. Office location: NEW YORK. LLC formed in DE on 02/22/2026. SSNY desig. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to: 600 MAMARONECK AVENUE, #400, HARRISON, NY, UNITED STATES, 10528. Arts. of Org. filed with DE SOS, 401 Federal St., Ste. 3 Dover, DE 19901. Any lawful purpose. 20342 Jan28 w Mar4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of TALCOTT GARDENS PRESERVATION, L.P. Cert. of LP filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/01/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LP: 30 Hudson Yards, 72nd Fl., NY, NY 10001. Latest date on which the LP may dissolve is 12/31/2125. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 18958 Dec24 w Jan28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of 400 CAPITAL ABTF IV ANNEEX FUND I LP Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/12/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/01/25. NYS fictitious name: 400 CAPITAL ABTF IV ANNEEX FUND I 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 the Partnership, 660 Fifth Ave., 27th Fl., NY, NY 10103. 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 of the State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/30/25. NYS fictitious name: ICNY TIMES SQUARE PROPC FEE OWNER, LP Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/09/25. Office location: NY County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/30/25. NYS fictitious name: ICNY TIMES SQUARE PROPC FEE OWNER, L.P. Duration of LP is Perpetual. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co., 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. Name and addr. of each general partner are available from SSNY. DE addr. of LP: 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of LP filed with DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 18962 Dec24 w Jan28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Accelerator Capital Partners LP. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 11/12/25. NYS fict. name: Accelerator Capital Partners L.P. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 169 Madison Ave., Ste. 3851S, NY, NY 10016. LP formed in DE: 10/28/22. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Name/addr. of genl. ptr. available from NY Sec. of State. Cert. of LP filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 20317 Jan28 w Mar4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Accelerator Capital Partners LP. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 11/12/25. NYS fict. name: Accelerator Capital Partners L.P. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 169 Madison Ave., Ste. 3851S, NY, NY 10016. LP formed in DE: 10/28/22. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St., Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr. of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Name/addr. of genl. ptr. available from NY Sec. of State. Cert. of LP filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 20317 Jan28 w Mar4

New York County

Court Calendars Continued From Page 12

653397/25 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2024 LLC v. K&L Const. LLC D/b/a K&L Contractors Et Al
651189/24 Grunberg 928 LLC v. Goldin Solutions, Inc. Et Al
161050/19 Lugo v. NY Community Bank 451303/25 People of The State of NY v. Moneylion Inc.
11961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rlty. v. Sapphire Estate
151246/24 Tejada v. Riverbridge Court Condominium Corp. And Operation Exodus Inner City, Inc.
158385/25 Varvaras v. 322 West 57th Owner LLC Et Al

Motion
159313/24 Exum v. Bldg Mgt. Co. Inc. Et Al
653397/25 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2024 LLC v. K&L Const. LLC D/b/a K&L Contractors Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
151387/19 Blackmon v. 925 Madison Ave., Inc.
158309/18 Buonocore v. NYS
155690/19 Chubb Nat. Ins. v. Sbp NY LLC 161063/19 Contreras v. NYC
157456/19 Cotto v. 685 First Rlty. Co.
150882/20 Elliott v. 509 W 34
157402/17 Ferguson v. NYC
152419/21 Flores v. West 38 Res L.L.C. Et Al
157595/19 Graves v. Sava Serbian Orthodox Church
153982/21 Jimenez v. Maxwell Kates, Inc.
153667/21 Marck v. Nail & Spa T2, Inc. Et Al
151657/20 NY Marine And General v. NY Firetech Inc.
166176/25 Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey v. Reyes
152775/20 Rothman v. 40 W 25 LLC
155991/21 Sotamba v. 183 B'way. Owner LLC Et Al
161465/25 The Legal Aid Society v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al

Motion
157456/19 Cotto v. 685 First Realty Company
157456/19 Cotto v. 685 First Rlty. Co.

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
151818/25 Jane 8 LLC D/b/a Incentra Village House v. NYC Bd. of Ed. of Standards And Appeals Et Al
10002/26 Rivera v. Charter Communications
155147/20 Villavicencio v. West 97th St. Rlty. Corp.
Motion
151818/25 Jane 8 LLC D/b/a Incentra Village House v. NYC Bd. of Ed. of Standards And Appeals Et Al
10002/26 Rivera v. Charter Communications

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
160541/19 Fukuyama v. Doe
161371/20 Martinez Toribio v. Walter Schik, Inc.
154979/22 Pellot v. Skanska USA Civil Northeast Inc. Et Al
162187/18 Quito v. 111 West 57th Prop. Owner
101299/25 Samuels v. NYC Dept. of Health
160270/25 Senderowitz v. Touro Univ.
156786/24 Valencia v. Carmel Partners Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
104418/10 Barbagallo v. Vanessa N. Dinnal
159112/25 Chowdhury v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
805093/23 Pekerman v. Chessin Md
805188/24 Piepes v. Walls M.D.
THURSDAY, JAN. 29
805258/23 Anna Mats v. Greuner M.D.
805446/23 Baugh v. Rozenberg D.D.S.
805276/23 Carroll Pieren Regis And David Regis-Parsons As Administrators of The Estate of Alyson A. Regis v. NYU Langone Hosps. Et Al
805193/21 French v. NYU Langone Medical Center Et Al
805493/23 Johnson v. Diane S. Person
100519/25 Miss Elegant v. Dr. Arthur
805159/25 Moradov v. Northwell Health Et Al
805336/18 Papp v. NYU Langone Health System
805312/16 Salas v. New York-Presbyterian
805372/24 Small v. Tornambe M.D.

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
805115/22 Anroff Md v. Dewitt Rehabilitation And Nursing Center, Inc. Et Al
805387/23 Bek v. Mazlin M.D.
805100/22 Delucia v. Tang
805011/29 Orange Manhattan Park Medicine
153376/17 Gonzalez v. Mt. Sinai Hosp.
805312/25 Guillaume v. The Mount Sinai Hosp. Et Al
150542/22 Hogan v. Amsterdam Nursing Home Et Al
805377/22 Itzkowitch v. Bernstein M.D.
805197/24 Kettenmann v. D'Angelica M.D.
805402/18 Lubbers v. Engel
805034/23 Marshall v. Leitman
100519/25 Miss Elegant v. Dr. Arthur
100198/19 Orange Orchestra Properties v. Gentry Unltd, Inc.
805430/23 Peck v. Chung M.D.
805252/22 Papp v. Cohen D.O.
805403/21 Perry v. NYU Langone Hosps.
805284/22 Portillo v. Su Md
805246/21 Periva v. Parsons M.D.
805358/22 Ray v. Shafer
100499/25 Roth v. NY Univ. Dental School
805146/24 Rowland v. Memorial Hosp. For Cancer And Allied Diseases
805134/24 Santiago v. NYU College of Dentistry Et Al
805181/22 Santini v. Goldstein M.D.
805281/23 Vega v. Devecchio M.D.

Motion
805034/23 Marshall v. Leitman
100519/25 Miss Elegant v. Dr. Arthur
805403/21 Perry v. NYU Langone Hosps.
805284/22 Portillo v. Su Md
100499/25 Roth v. NY Univ. Dental School

111 CENTRE STREET

Part 25 Guardianship

Justice Ilana J. Marcus
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5675
Room 1254

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
158763/22 De Horta v. NYC
154054/19 Henriquez v. NYC
166463/25 McKeithan v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
159425/22 Watt v. NYC Et Al
153181/22 Wong v. NYC Et Al
154194/22 Wright v. NYC Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
161714/25 Best v. NYC Et Al
157142/20 Kelly v. NYC Et Al

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
161660/24 Acosta v. Lower Manhattan Dev. Corp. Et Al
162425/25 Escalona-Martinez v. NYCH&HC Corp. (barlem Hosp.)
151701/24 Samet v. NYC Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
150018/26 First Funds v. Pnc Bank
100869/25 Gilbert v. Von Der Burg
154527/23 Herrera v. 50 Hymc LLC Et Al
150395/25 Matheson v. City Univ. of NY Et Al
165066/25 Wagner v. NYS Office of Court Admin.

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
160672/2458 Kenmare Associates LLC Et Al v. Goodies on Kenmare Inc. Et Al
651212/25 Fabrique Innovations, Inc. v. Office Depot
656467/25 Rodriguez v. 503 West 111 St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.
152470/15 Yacinthe v. Pamdh Enterprises Inc. D/b/a

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
157327/24 1560 Broadway Company v. Content on The Square
65425/25/2461 Eighth LLC v. Obaid
651383/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Monphelais Delvois Et Al
654512/25 Anderson Mill P.C. v. Haart
453357/25 Asrov v.
159405/25 Brown v. Winston Staffing LLC Et Al
160706/22 E.M. v. Franklin Plaza Apts., Inc. Et Al
156818/19 Geraghty v. Zhu
158517/23 Gonzalez v. Abc Holdco LLC
153278/25 Hazzard v. Pmpa, Inc.
150425/26 The Matter of The General Assignment For The Benefit of The Creditors of Shenanzhu LLC v. Morrison
162631/25 Salazar v. 100-106 West 141 St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
160084/23 Sanchez v. Billiard Balls Mgt. LLC D/b/a State Et Al
101323/25 Spiritdis v. N.Y.C. Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene

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

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
158180/24119 Baxter St. Ce LLC v. Castro
653835/24301/69 Owners Corp. v. Posner
154432/22363 East 76th St. Corp. v. Schulz
155047/24 Adirondack Ins. Exch. As Subrogee of Weitao Zou v. Globe Union Industrial Corp. Et Al
651052/22 Allaham v. Longst. D&R LLC Et Al
650337/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Fernandez
654765/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Graham
654155/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Juan Martinez Sanchez Et Al
655814/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Shumeem
654468/22 Awaken Advisors Ltd. v. Atlas Tech. Mgmt Pte Et Al
655043/22 Board of Mgrs. of The 84 Bedford Condominium v. Pamela Court LLC
452894/23 Comm'rs. of The NYS Ins. Fund v. Equity One (westbury Plaza) LLC

651661/24 Dumont v. Cohen
659116/24 Gill v. Kore Ai, Inc. Et Al
153593/24 Glandu v. NYC Et Al
152410/24 Hanhanan v. 5 Beekman Master Tenant
157621/23 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Hercule
153968/24 Infinity Standard Ins. Co. v. Vargas
656670/21 Lee v. Jay Housing Corp. Et Al
159847/24 Lee v. Walker
65413/23 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. France
655111/23 Lone Oak Oak Beach Corp. v. Taylor Group Plumbing, Heating & Mechanical Inc. Et Al
650438/23 Lovell Safety Mgt. Co., L.L.C. v. Par Wall Finishing Corp.
160854/24 Morelli Law Firm v. Frankfurt Kurin Kleit & Selz Pc Et Al
153062/24 Munoz v. Tishman Const. Corp. Et Al
150707/22 Penninpeid v. Lend Lease (us) Const. Lmb Inc. Et Al
157299/24 Pettit v. NYCHA Et Al
652316/22 Simmons v. Systems 2000 Plumbing LLC
651788/23 Sugatan, Inc. v. Sbla Beauty, Inc.
450140/23 The Comm'rs. of The State Ins. Fund v. Par Wall Finishing Corp.
651425/25 Yee v. Mulberry Condominium Associates
161605/23 Zambudio v. Lord Shivas Properties

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
651208/23 Beauty Gem, Inc. v. Joshi
156960/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Carolina
FRIDAY, JAN. 30
656161/23 Advantage Platform Services Inc. D/b/a Advantage Capital Funding v. Macy Enterprises, Inc. D/b/a Macy Enterprises Et Al
656891/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. De Silvestre
653861/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Kelly
654004/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Maldonado
451277/23 NYCHA v. Johnson
653364/23 Xi Wu Hu v. 6120 Rlty. LLC

32 Mortgage Foreclosure Part
Justice Francis A. Kahn, III
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5607
Room 1127B

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
802036/24 Athene Annuity And Life Co. v. Suggs
805046/24 Citizens Bank Na v. Cohen
805424/24 Citizens Bank Na v. Rehani
805324/25 Dd Notes LLC v. 126 West 121st St.
850239/24 Deutsche Bank Nat. Trust Co. As Trustee For American Home Mortgage Assets Trust 2007-1 Certificates v. Gordon
850207/25 Flushing Bank v. Diaz
805132/25 Goldman Sachs Bank USA v. 58 Rly. Yt Llc Et Al
850029/25 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. 1055 Park Ave 4 Llc Et Al
850298/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Jestonowska
850417/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Zhou
158816/22 NYCTL 2021-A Trust v. Clinton Assoc. For A Renewed Environment (c.A.R.E.) Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850438/25 Stormfield Capital Funding I v. 2647 B'way. Apts Llc Et Al
850276/21 A.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Raymond Bouderau As Trustee of The Raymond Bouderau Revocable Trust Dated May 27
850121/25 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Chatman Jr.
850406/24 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. 240 Park Ave. South Owner Lp
850410/24 Ubs Bank USA v. Mam 42nd St. Llc Et Al
850343/25 Wells Fargo Bank v. Moore

850278/24 Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Wilson

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
850145/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Hasegawa

850435/24 Asm Spv v. Sngi Rlty. Llc Et Al
850402/24 Board of Mgrs. of 108 Leonard Condominium on Behalf of The Unit Owners of 108 Leonard Condominium v. Figlia
850613/23 Brick Air Capital LLC v. Nld Properties, Inc. Et Al
850479/23 Citimortgage v. Crescent St. Ventures LLC Et Al
850089/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Asante
850077/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Gabryszak
850497/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Liberman
850076/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Turner
850088/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Villamar
850309/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Tip Top Tenth Ave. Mgt., Inc. Et Al
850376/24 Td Bank v. Snyder Trustee of The Snyder Family Trust
453275/22 Tico Investment Vehicle Viii v. Barievic
850311/24 Toorak Capital Partners LLC v. West 125 St. Rlty. Llc Et Al

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
850401/25 146 89 St. Funding LLC v. 146 E 89 Borrower 1 LLC Et Al
850105/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Sheffer
850273/25 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. 406 Manhattan Llc Et Al
850503/25 Sig Rcrs A/b Mf 2023 Venture Llc v. Aha Rlty. Partners Llc Et Al
850505/25 Sig Rcrs A/b Mf 2023 Venture Llc v. West 151 St. Associates LLC Et Al

Part 38
Justice Ashlee Crawford
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3235
Room 1166

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
652978/216 East 39th St. Hlgs. LLC v. Strathmore Cos.
151447/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rodriguez
452906/24 Sales v. Justiniano

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
654955/19 Bath & Body Works v. Miner Fleet Mgmt. Group

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
653586/21 Cooper-Nolasco v. Royal Waste Services Inc D/b/a Royal Waste Services Et Al
154387/20 Gustavo Matute v. Defalco Const. Inc.
151429/18 Hellman v. St. Tropez Condominium
651193/24 Itzhak v. Briarwood Ins. Services Inc. Et Al
654381/21 Open Architectural Prods. LLC D/b/a Open Awd v. Jds Const. Group LLC Et Al

Part 42
Justice Emily Morales-Minerva
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3237
Room 574

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
652004/23 Agape Builders v. U.W. Marx, Inc. Et Al
155692/20 American Express Nat. Bank v. Portilla
651112/25 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Burgess
650485/25 Baltic Prop. Group LLC v. NYC Economic Dev. Corp.
450854/25 Fields v. Niblack
654287/25 Perez v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Langston Condominium Et Al
652045/23 Red Apple 670 Pacific St. LLC v. Finkelman
651907/24 Samuels v. S.M.L. Food Corp. Et Al
160896/24 Solomon v. Lifeworks Tech. Group LLC
450552/25 The Burlington Ins. Co. v. Marquis Hamplons LLC And The Bathing Club LLC D/b/a Capri Southam
162317/25 The Estate Agency LLC v. Bruno
655638/24 Tremont Electric Co., Inc. v. J. United Electrical Contracting Corp. Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
654659/22 Anvil Ironworks Inc. v. Feinstein Iron Works, Inc.
655125/25 Belenzon v. Berger
100995/25 Campbell v. Bernat
655814/25 Chamovskikh v. Rian
160528/23 Roza 14w Llc v. Iuliano

FRIDAY, JAN. 30
656460/21 Buchman v. 117 East 72nd St. Corp. Et Al
650576/25 Buchman v. 117 East 72nd St. Corp. Et Al
159155/25 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2024 LLC v. Wtxhs LLC D/b/a Wtxhs Et Al
657198/21 Landa v. Friedman
655610/25 Perelson Weiner Lp v. Allstar Marketing Group
654279/25 Stearn v. Protective Life & Annuity Ins. Co. Et Al
162317/25 The Estate Agency LLC v. Bruno

Motion
657198/21 Landa v. Friedman

Part 47
Justice Paul A. Goetz
111 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3743
Room 1021

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 28
150722/24 Golebicki v. 4 East 74 Llc Et Al
160199/25 Sadik v. Morrison
153474/22 Trach Mechanical LLC v. Sixty Hotels LLC Et Al

Motion
153474/22 Trach Mechanical LLC v. Sixty Hotels LLC Et Al

THURSDAY, JAN. 29
150683/21 335 West 39th Street Realty Company v. Edries
156237/20 Alatorre v. Port Auth. of NY
155478/24 Allen v. Port Auth. of NY And New Jersey Et Al
152045/24 Alvarado v. NYCHA
150786/24 Amar v. 230fa Llc Et Al
151895/25 American Multi-Cinema, Inc. Et Al v. Equinox Hlgs., Inc. Et Al
157448/23 Armenta v. Inroncad Artists Inc Et Al