

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Eastern District of New York

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
US DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ SEP 30 2025 ★

BROOKLYN OFFICE

Lidia M. Orrego

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff(s),

23-cv-6507 (SJB) (AYS)

-against-

Pasternack Tilker Ziegler
Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al.

Defendant(s).

RECEIVED
OCT - 1 2025
EDNY PRO SE OFFICE

Lidia M. Orrego

(name all parties

taking the appeal)*

appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the order

Imposing Unlawful Filing Injunction and Deprivation of Rights "retroactive" (describe the order)

entered on September 16, 2025 (state the date that the order was entered).

Plaintiff respectfully appeals from the Order in its entirety and from each part thereof.

Signature	<u>/s/ Lidia M. Orrego</u>
Name	<u>Lidia M. Orrego</u>
Prison ID	<u></u>
Address	<u>9508 Queens Blvd., Apt. 3E</u> <u>Rego Park, NY 11374</u>
Phone	<u>(347) 453-2234</u>
Email	<u>liorrego@gmail.com</u>

(Note to inmate filers: If you are an inmate confined in an institution and you seek the timing benefit of Fed. R. App. P. (4)(c)(1), complete Form 7 (Declaration of Inmate Filing) and file that declaration with this Notice of Appeal.)

*See Rule 3(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure for permissible ways of identifying appellants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
LIDIA M. ORREGO,

Plaintiff,

v.

PASTERNAK TILKER ZIEGLER
WALSH STANTON & ROMANO LLP ET AL.

Defendants.

-----X
Case No. 23-cv-6507-SJB-AYS

**INFORMATIONAL STATEMENT REGARDING UNLAWFUL FILING INJUNCTION
AND INTERFERENCE WITH COURT-ORDERED SUBSTITUTION MOTION**

This statement provides background for Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego's interlocutory appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the pre-filing injunction order entered on September 16, 2025, by Honorable Sanket J. Bulsara, United States District Judge.

According to the Pro Se Office, the filing injunction issued on September 16, 2025, encompasses and effectively blocks the undersigned's pending brief, Plaintiff's Motion for Substitution, which was due on October 14, 2025. Each side must file its papers on ECF, pursuant to the Court's prior scheduling order. This retroactive application interferes with an active deadline and precludes timely submission, resulting in prejudice to the Plaintiff, despite no showing of abuse or noncompliance. As a result, the injunction not only obstructs access to the Court but also denies a meaningful opportunity to be heard, further violating due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. See annexed Exhibit 3.

The filing injunction entered on **September 16, 2025** (see **Exhibit 1**) was issued sua sponte, without a motion, hearing, or factual findings, thereby violating established procedural and constitutional safeguards. Specifically, it violates **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 65(b)**. Constitutionally, the injunction infringes on the **First Amendment** right to petition the Court, the

Fifth Amendment guarantee of due process, and the **Fourteenth Amendment** right to equal protection. It also raises serious concerns under **28 U.S.C. §§ 455(a)** (judicial impartiality) and **453** (judicial oath of office).

Most critically, this injunction obstructs compliance with a **pending, Court-ordered Substitution Motion**, governed by the briefing schedule issued by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on **July 28, 2025**. That order requires the Plaintiff to serve the Motion by **August 29, 2025**, Opposition by **September 29, 2025**, and a reply by **October 14, 2025**, with the full motion to be filed by **October 20, 2025**.

Representative Dan Goldman publicly addressed a **comparable situation** in a letter and social media post dated **September 26, 2025** (see **Exhibit 2**), where he described the deprivation of rights as “a blatant violation.” This case presents similarly serious concerns, especially given the impact on a self-represented litigant attempting to comply with active Court directives.

The Plaintiff is unlawfully barred from filing papers electronically via the Pro Se Portal. This total denial of access to the Court constitutes a blatant violation of her Constitutional rights. The restriction is not grounded in any finding of frivolous filings but rather imposed precisely because the Plaintiff has been submitting evidence that exposes the Defendants’ falsehoods in their filings. Such selective prohibition of access to justice undermines the principles of due process and equal protection under the law.

The Order incorrectly states that Plaintiff’s Letter Motion for Leave violated the injunction. This is factually wrong. In the related case **24-cv-7247, Orrego v. Savitsky et al., DE [30]**, Plaintiff filed a 144-page document via the Pro Se Portal, which included exhibits. **Additionally, Plaintiff filed in 23-cv-6507, Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al., DE [103], a 10-page document via the Pro Se Portal on August 15, 2025, and August 20, 2025, respectively.**

Plaintiff never received any notice or complaint that these filings violated the first unlawful injunction dated **August 14, 2025**. The September 16, 2025, injunction, by barring all filings without exception or cause, prevents the Plaintiff from meeting these deadlines, despite no finding of abusive conduct or procedural violations.

This **broad and retroactive ban** effectively amounts to a **complete denial of access to the Court**, applied without due process and lacking the procedural safeguards required under Federal Law. See annexed Exhibit 1.

It is legally improper that Plaintiff's submission, filed initially as a 10-page document (**DE [106]**), was docketed by the District Court as only one page. Under **FRCP 5(d)(4)**, the Clerk is obligated to file papers as submitted and may not refuse or alter them for form. By omitting pages, the Court created an incomplete and misleading record, materially misrepresenting the Plaintiff's request. This error deprives Plaintiff of due process and a fair record for judicial review. Pursuant to **FRAP 10(e)** and **FRCP 60(a)**, the record must be corrected to reflect the full submission. Alternatively, relief is warranted under **FRCP 60(b)** due to the prejudice caused by this misrepresentation. The Court's continued failure to address Plaintiff's repeated requests for clarification compounds this prejudice and constitutes a denial of access to justice. See annexed Exhibits 3, 4, 5.

The District Court committed several Due Process Violations regarding the filings:

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d)(4) – The clerk “must not refuse to file a paper solely because it is not in the form prescribed by these rules.” Once filed, the entire submission must be entered into the record. Missing pages mean the record is incomplete.

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10(e) – If there is a dispute about whether the record truly reflects what was filed, a party may move to correct or supplement the record.

Due Process – An incomplete or altered filing deprives the party of a fair record for judicial review, which courts recognize as a due process violation.

Clerical Mistake Relief (FRCP 60(a)) – If the error is the court's, party can move to correct the docket entry.

Accordingly, immediate reconsideration or vacatur of the September 16, 2025, order is warranted to restore proper access to the Court and preserve the integrity of ongoing proceedings.

Attached Exhibits

- **Exhibit 1 – Dated September 16, 2025:** Email – Activity in Case 2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS, Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al., Order on Motion for Leave to File – Injunction
- **Exhibit 2 – Dated September 26, 2025:** X Post and Letter – Rep. Dan Goldman – Deprivation of Rights
- **Exhibit 3 – Dated August 20, 2025: DE [106]** - Request for Leave to File MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION of Incomprehensible and Impracticable Orders by J. Bulsara and Shields on NEW DEFENDANTS, Requesting NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS and Extension of Time to Serve per DE [78], [79], [80] – **MISSING pages in violation of FRCP.**
- **Exhibit 4 - Dated August 20, 2025: ORIGINAL FILED DE [106]** - Request for Leave to File MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION of Incomprehensible and Impracticable Orders by J. Bulsara and Shields on NEW DEFENDANTS, Requesting NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS and Extension of Time to Serve per DE [78], [79], [80].

- **Exhibit 5 – Dated September 18, 2025:** Letter from Pro Se Office

Dated: September 30, 2025
Rego Park, New York

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego
Lidia M. Orrego
Plaintiff Pro Se
95-08 Queens Blvd, Apt. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
(347) 453-2234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

Certificate of Service

I certify that on September 30, 2025, I filed this statement with the Clerk of the District Court in person at the Eastern District of New York.

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego
Lidia M. Orrego
Plaintiff Pro Se

EXHIBIT 1



Lidia Orrego <litorrego@gmail.com>

Activity in Case 2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al Order on Motion for Leave to File

1 message

ecf_bounces@nyed.uscourts.gov <ecf_bounces@nyed.uscourts.gov>
To: nobody@nyed.uscourts.gov

Tue, Sep 16, 2025 at 7:08 PM

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mailbox is unattended.

Additional Security Enhancements Coming Soon For information visit PACER website

<https://pacer.uscourts.gov/announcements/2025/06/27/additional-security-enhancements-coming-soon>

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 9/16/2025 at 7:08 PM EDT and filed on 9/16/2025

Case Name: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al

Case Number: 2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS

Filer:

Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

ORDER: Plaintiff Orrego has now filed multiple applications seeking leave to file additional motions and/or open new cases. Though the cover letters for these motions comply with the Court's admonition that leave be sought in a short letter with a word limit, the motions attach hundreds, if not thousands of pages of material, which not only violate the filing Injunction, but are unnecessarily duplicative material.

The Clerk's Office is directed to return all of this material via first-class mail to Plaintiff. The motions seeking leave, in this case at Dkt. No. [106], are denied. Plaintiff is prohibited from making any further filings on this docket, or using the portal available to pro se litigants, absent further order of this Court (no leave may be sought). The Clerk's Office is directed to terminate Plaintiff Orrego's access to the pro se portal, to reject and promptly return to Plaintiff any motion or document submitted by her, and not to file any submission on ECF or retain custody of such material.

Plaintiff is reminded that her filing of this unnecessary material has simply impeded, delayed, and obstructed the Court's ability to resolve the merits of the case, and its ability to move this case forward, to trial (if appropriate). The Court will lift this filing Injunction following resolution of the pending motions in all of her cases, in order to give her an opportunity to object, appeal, or reconsider any decision, or to make any post-decision filings attendant to trial, should the Court determine that the case should proceed to trial or further discovery. But until the Court renders such decisions, the filing injunction imposed by this order will remain in place. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 9/16/2025. (LOG)

2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

EXHIBIT 2

← Post




Rep. Dan Goldman
@RepDanGoldman



Yesterday, an ICE officer violently threw a young mother to the ground at 26 Federal Plaza in front of her 2 children—sending her to the hospital.

This assault is a blatant violation of her rights.

@NYCComptroller and I have referred this officer to @AGPamBondi for criminal investigation. New Yorkers seeking asylum deserve safety and dignity, not excessive force from agents outside courtrooms.



3:17 PM · Sep 26, 2025 · 39.8K Views

602

659

1.9K

39





September 26, 2025

The Honorable Pamela J. Bondi
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Attorney General Bondi:

We write to refer for your review, investigation, and potential prosecution an incident of excessive force by an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officer that took place at 26 Federal Plaza in New York City on Thursday, September 25. According to witnesses — including members of the press — and documented by video footage, an ICE officer violently and unnecessarily threw a woman, Monica, to the ground in front of her young children, causing her to hit the back of her head on the floor and require treatment at the hospital. The incident took place shortly after ICE agents detained Monica's husband following a routine court appearance related to his asylum application.¹

This flagrantly egregious conduct by this ICE officer is in apparent violation of 18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of Rights Under the Color of Law), which makes it a federal crime for any officer or agent acting under color of law to willfully deprive an individual of rights that are secured or protected by the laws of the United States and the Constitution.² In this case, the officer, acting under the color of law, willfully used excessive physical force by throwing a young mother to the ground and thereby deprived the victim of her Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. As you know, the Fourth Amendment applies to all persons in the United States, including Monica.

Federal prosecutors have a history of successfully pursuing similar cases. For instance, in 2022, a federal jury convicted a Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officer of violating § 242 after he used unreasonable force on an individual at the Calexico Port of Entry. Evidence presented in this case involved surveillance video and witness testimony showing the CBP officer grabbing a man from his car, throwing him to the ground, and causing injury during their encounter.³ The officer's conviction underscores how deliberate use of force and abuse of power by federal officers warrant legal action under the scope of § 242.

¹ U.S. Agent Pushes Woman to Floor in Immigration Courthouse Confrontation, New York Times (Sept. 25, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/25/nyregion/ice-push-woman-ny.html>

² 18 U.S.C. § 242 (2024).

³ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office for the S. Dist. of Cal., Customs and Border Protection Officer Convicted by Federal Jury of Using Unreasonable Force at Calexico Port of Entry and Obstructing Justice (Mar. 9, 2022), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-sdca/pr/customs-and-border-protection-officer-convicted-federal-jury-using-unreasonable-force>.

Page 2

Moreover, your own Justice Department has demonstrated a consistent pattern of filing felony charges for far less serious conduct. A hallmark of equal justice under the law is that like cases are treated alike. If, as you are fond of saying, "no one is above the law,"⁴ then certainly this incident deserves prosecution under the very precedent set by you as Attorney General.

We respectfully request that you immediately investigate this incident in a timely manner and enforce the laws prohibiting this gross misconduct to the fullest extent. Every person in this country must be assured that federal officers are not above the law, and that if they engage in abuses of power they will be held accountable for their actions.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



Dan Goldman
Member of Congress



Brad Lander
New York City Comptroller


cc: The Honorable Jay Clayton
United States Attorney, Southern District of New York

⁴ Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), "No one is above the law. Today's indictment reflects this Department of Justice's commitment to holding those who abuse positions of power accountable for misleading the American people. We will follow the facts in this case," X (formerly Twitter), September 25, 2025, <https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1971345371583611099>

EXHIBIT 3

August 21, 2025 *** Filed ***
11:40 AM, 21 AUG, 2025
U.S.D.C., Eastern District of New York

Honorable Sanket J. Bulsara
United States District Judge
Eastern District of New York
Central Islip, New York
VIA ECF Pro Se Office



Re: Case No. 23cv6507-SJB-AYS

**Request for Leave to File MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION and ADJOURNMENT until
Clarification of Shields' Order Dated 7/28/2025 Due to Lack of Specificity and Ambiguity
Regarding UNSERVED NEW DEFENDANTS,
Addition New Defendants vs. Substitution New Defendant**

Dear Judge Bulsara:

I seek leave to file a **Motion for Clarification and Adjournment** of Judge Shields' July 28 order, which is ambiguous and lacks specificity. Order grants an Extension to August 5, 2025 and substitution briefing to August 29, 2025, but fails clarify treatment "non-parties" versus New Defendants. Clarke is the only substitution per State filings (Exhibit 1), with planned service (Exhibit 2).

Must the motion be served on new defendants in the Amended Complaint, unserved due to the Court's failure issue summonses?

Judge Katsanos' order lacking jurisdiction over Deceased Heller evidences corruption.

DE [102] Violated Due Process. Pro se leniency requested.

Word count: 100

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego
Lidia M. Orrego
Plaintiff Pro Se
95-08 Queens Blvd, Apt. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
Phone: (347) 453-2234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

EXHIBIT 4

August 20, 2025

Honorable Sanket J. Bulsara
United States District Judge
Eastern District of New York
Central Islip, New York
VIA ECF Pro Se Office

Re: Case No. 23cv6507-SJB-AYS

Request for Leave to File MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION of Incomprehensible and Impracticable Orders by J. Bulsara and Shields on NEW DEFENDANTS, Requesting NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS and Extension of Time to Serve per DE [78], [79], [80]

Dear Judge Bulsara:

I seek leave to file a **MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION** of incomprehensible orders by J. Bulsara and Shields.

On 2/26, Amended Complaint filed (DE [41]), per Court order confirming service for Defendants only VIA EMAIL, no service needed for OLD Defendants (DE [42], [43], 4/10-11).

Court ignored consistent requests for **NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS**, not successors of deceased Defendant, not part of substitution (DE [67], [68], [71], [72], [79]).

Shields' 5/14 order and DE [78], [79], [80] require service, but no **NEW SUMMONS ISSUED**. Objection DE [102] Violates Due Process.

Exhibit 1 highlights order contradictions. Pro se leniency requested.

Word count: 100

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego
Lidia M. Orrego
Plaintiff Pro Se
95-08 Queens Blvd, Apt. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
Phone: (347) 453-2234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

EXHIBIT 1

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

[Query](#) [Reports](#) [Utilities](#) [Help](#) [Log Out](#)

NPROSE, PROSENEF

U.S. District Court
Eastern District of New York (Central Islip)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS

Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al

Assigned to: Judge Sanket J. Bulsara

Referred to: Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields

related Cases: [2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS](#)[2:25-cv-00736-SJB-AYS](#)[2:25-cv-00769-SJB-AYS](#)[2:24-cv-07247-SJB-AYS](#)

Cause: 18:1964 Racketeering (RICO) Act

Date Filed: 08/31/2023

Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 470 Racketeer/Corrupt Organization

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
02/26/2025		ORDER: The Court adopts the parties' proposed briefing schedule 40 for Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and Defendants' respective motions to dismiss. If Plaintiff chooses to amend, Plaintiff must submit an Amended Complaint for filing and forward a copy of the Amended Complaint to Defendants' counsel via email by 3/20/2025 . Defendants must serve, but not file, their respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email and file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket by 4/23/2025 . Plaintiff must serve, but not file, her opposition to Defendants' respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Defendants' counsel via email by 5/21/2025 . Defendants' counsel must file proof of service of Plaintiff's opposition upon Defendants by 5/23/2025 . Defendants must serve their respective replies in further support of their motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email; file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket; file Defendants' respective moving papers in support of their motions to dismiss, Plaintiff's opposition, and Defendants' respective replies; and forward courtesy copies of each Memoranda of Law in support and opposition to the Court, all by 6/11/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 2/26/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 02/26/2025) SERVICE VIA EMAIL "OLD DEFENDANTS"
03/21/2025	41	AMENDED COMPLAINT against Jane Doe, John Doe, First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Ginu Jacob, Esq., Sam Cohen, Esq., Joseph Mercurio, Esq., Andrew Ziemianski, Esq., Matthew Funk, Esq., Mariana Vizuite, Lewis Heller, Esq., filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 03/21/2025)
04/10/2025	42	Letter from Pro Se Litigant Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Bulsara, dated 4/10/25 Re: Subject: Acknowledgment of Amended Complaint and Waiver of Additional Service (GO) (Entered: 04/10/2025)
04/11/2025	43	Letter MOTION to Compel that Counsel Accept Service and for New Scheduling Order by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 04/11/2025)
04/11/2025	44	RESPONSE to Motion re 43 Letter MOTION to Compel that Counsel Accept Service and for New Scheduling Order filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 04/11/2025)
04/15/2025		ORDER: The Court declines the request 44 of counsel for the appearing Defendants—Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano, LLP and Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LL—to delay briefing on any motion to dismiss until conclusion of service on any new Defendant. As such, the Court adopts Plaintiff's proposed briefing schedule 43 for all appearing Defendants' motions to dismiss: Defendants must serve, but not file, their respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email and file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket by 6/20/2025 . Plaintiff must serve, but not file, her opposition to Defendants' respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Defendants' counsel via email by 7/21/2025 . Defendants' counsel must file proof of service of Plaintiff's opposition upon Defendants by 7/23/2025 . Defendants must serve their respective replies in further support of their motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email; file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket; file Defendants' respective moving papers in support of their motions to dismiss, Plaintiff's opposition, and Defendants' respective replies; and forward courtesy copies of each Memoranda of Law in support and opposition to the Court, all by 8/11/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 4/15/2025. (YBP) (Entered: 04/15/2025)
05/06/2025	45	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis , MOTION to Vacate , MOTION for Sanctions , MOTION for Extension of Time to File Rule 4(m) Service Deadline, MOTION to Compel Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/07/2025)
05/07/2025	46	RESPONSE to Motion re 45 MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File Rule 4(m) Service Deadline MOTION to Compel Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 05/07/2025)

18

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

05/08/2025	47	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) service deadline from June 18, 2025, to July 18, 2025 and permission to proceed with my motion filed on May 6, 2025</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/08/2025)
05/08/2025	48	AFFIDAVIT of Service for DE 47 - Letter Motion Requesting Extension of Time for Rule 4(M) Service Deadline, Permission To Proceed with Motion for Relief (DE 45) or For A Conference, and Reply To Defendants' Letter (DE 46) served on Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP, and Rivkin Radler LLP, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/09/2025)
05/09/2025		ORDER: The Court denies Plaintiff Orrego's request 45 to vacate the Order from April 15, 2025, which granted an extension to the briefing schedule for Defendants' motions to dismiss. The deadlines in the briefing schedule will remain as previously ordered. As to Plaintiff's motion 47 filed May 8, 2025, the Court grants Plaintiff's request to proceed with her motion 45 filed May 6, 2025, but denies the request to reply to the response from Defendants Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP 46 . The Court respectfully refers all other matters in Plaintiff's requests—which concern pretrial management—for decision by Judge Shields. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 5/9/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 05/09/2025)
05/13/2025	49	RESPONSE to Motion re 45 MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 05/13/2025)
05/13/2025	50	MOTION to Compel U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions, MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/13/2025)
05/14/2025		ORDER denying 45 Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis; deferring ruling on 45 Motion for Sanctions; granting 45 Motion for Extension of Time to File; deferring ruling on 45 Motion to Compel; granting 47 Motion for Extension of Time to File; deferring ruling on 50 Motion to Compel; granting 50 Motion for Extension of Time to File. Plaintiff's applications are GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks an order directing the U.S. Marshals Service to serve the summons and Amended Complaint on Defendants, the motion is DENIED. Similarly, Plaintiff's request to serve Defendants by cost-reducing methods is likewise DENIED. Therefore, Plaintiff shall serve the summons and Amended Complaint in accord with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. However, Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to July 18, 2025 to effectuate service of process is GRANTED. The Court defers ruling on Plaintiff's requests seeking sanctions on defense counsel and an order directing Defendants' counsel to file a suggestion of death/substitution motion for defendant Lewis Heller, until defense counsel has submitted opposition to the requests. In that regard, by May 30, 2025, defense counsel shall submit opposition, if any, to Plaintiff's request for sanctions and request for an order directing counsel to file a substitution motion for defendant Lewis Heller. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 5/14/2025. (DM) (Entered: 05/14/2025)
05/28/2025	51	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,,,, Order on Motion for Extension of Time to File,,,,,, Order on Motion to Compel,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
05/30/2025	52	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Opposition re 45 MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant, 50 MOTION to Compel U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # 1 Ex. A - Email Correspondence Exchanged by the parties, # 2 Ex. B - Judge Kerrigan's Order sanctioning Ms. Orrego, # 3 Ex. C - October 30, 2024 letter to Judge Kerrigan and related Order, # 4 Ex. D - Ms. Orrego's April 14 email., # 5 Ex. E - Amended Complaint in the Legal Malpractice Action, # 6 Ex. F - Motion to Dismiss in the Legal Malpractice Action, # 7 Ex. G - April 4 letter to Judge Katsanos in the Legal Malpractice Action re Heller's death) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
05/30/2025	53	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re 45 MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant, 50 MOTION to Compel U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
06/02/2025	54	REPLY to Response to Motion re 51 Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,,,, Order on Motion for Extension of Time to File,,,,,, Order on Motion to Compel,,, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/02/2025)
06/03/2025	55	REPLY in Opposition re 54 Reply to Response to Motion, and Request for Conference filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) Modified to add a motion for hearing on 6/4/2025 (LF). (Entered: 06/03/2025)
06/03/2025	56	REPLY in Opposition to 55 REPLY in Opposition re: 54 Reply to Response to Motion, and Request for Conference, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/03/2025)
06/03/2025	57	AFFIDAVIT of Service for 56 Reply served on Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP and Rivkin Radler LLP on 6/3/2025, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/03/2025)

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

06/13/2025	58	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/13/2025	59	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery /Adjournment of the briefing schedule for Defendant's motion to dismiss, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/13/2025	60	Letter Request for a Conference concerning ECF Document Nos. 58 and 59 by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Biegel, Jason) Modified original letter entry into a motion on 6/16/2025 (LF). (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/18/2025	61	Letter confirming service of Motion to Dismiss by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Attachments: # 1 Email to Plaintiff enclosing motion papers) (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/18/2025	62	Letter confirming service of motion to dismiss on plaintiff by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/18/2025	63	Letter from Lidia Orrego to Judge Bulsara dated 6/18/2025 Re: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, et al., Case No. 23-cv-6507-SJB-AYS Second Letter-Motion to Affirm No Waiver of Pending Motions, Request Expedited Ruling on DE 59 , Seek Further Adjournment, and Address Excessive Favoritism and Gross Ethical Violations. (NF) (Entered: 06/20/2025)
06/19/2025	64	Notice of MOTION for Sanctions And to Defer Motions to Dismiss Before District Judge Sanket J. Bulsara by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/20/2025)
06/23/2025		ORDER: The motion for adjournment of the briefing schedule for Defendants' motion to dismiss 59 is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 6/23/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 06/23/2025)
06/24/2025	65	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery /of Denial of Adjournment of Motion to Dismiss Briefing Schedule (DE 59) by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/24/2025)
06/24/2025	66	COPY OF 65 Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery /of Denial of Adjournment of Motion to Dismiss Briefing Schedule (DE 59) by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/24/2025)
07/01/2025		ORDER: Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration 65 is denied. Local Civil Rule 6.3 governs motions for reconsideration. It provides, "a notice of motion for reconsideration must be served within 14 days after the entry of the court's order being challenged. There must be served with the notice of motion a memorandum setting forth concisely the matters or controlling decisions which the moving party believes the court has overlooked." Reconsideration is "an extraordinary request that is granted only in rare circumstances, such as where the court failed to consider evidence or binding authority." <i>Van Buskirk v. United Grp. of Companies, Inc.</i> , 935 F.3d 49, 54 (2d Cir. 2019). "A motion for reconsideration should be granted only when the [moving party] identifies 'an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.'" <i>Kolel Beth Yechiel Mechil of Tartikov, Inc. v. YLL Irrevocable Tr.</i> , 729 F.3d 99, 104 (2d Cir. 2013) (quoting <i>Virgin Atl. Airways, Ltd. v. Nat'l Mediation Bd.</i> , 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992)). Plaintiff has failed to "point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked—matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court." <i>Id.</i> (quoting <i>Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.</i> , 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995)). (See Mem. of Law in Supp. of Pl.'s Letter Mot. for Reconsideration dated June 24, 2025, Dkt. No. 65). This case has been pending for some time, and has not moved past its initial stages. Resolving the motions to dismiss will not prejudice Plaintiff's ability to serve any of the remaining parties and continue to litigate against them. The reasons proffered for further delay are without merit. Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration 65 is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/1/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 07/01/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER denying 51 Motion for Reconsideration. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is denied. The Court affirms its previous orders denying Plaintiff's request for an order directing the U.S. Marshals Service to serve the summons and Amended Complaint on Defendants. Similarly, the Court affirms its previous order denying Plaintiff's request to serve Defendants by cost-reducing methods. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/8/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER denying 45 Motion for Sanctions; denying 45 Motion to Compel; denying 50 Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's motion to compel substitution of Defendant Heller is DENIED. Plaintiff may move the Court to amend the complaint to reflect the proper party, or, as a party to this litigation, may move for substitution herself. Plaintiff's motion for sanctions is also DENIED. Plaintiff's conclusory allegations of bad faith do not constitute the granting of sanctions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 11 and 28 U.S.C. §1927. Additionally, <i>pro se</i> litigants are not entitled to recover sanctions in the form of costs for time spent litigating a dispute. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/8/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/15/2025	67	MOTION to Vacate DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 07/15/2025)
07/15/2025	68	Amended MOTION to Vacate DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 07/15/2025)

Court ignored issuing new Summons for New Defendants.

Court ignored issuing new Summons for New Defendants.

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

07/15/2025	70	Letter from Lidia Orrego to Judge Bulsara dated 7/15/2025 re: inquire about my inability to access or view my Letter Motion to Vacate, docketed as DE 68 (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/15/2025	71	Letter MOTION to Vacate July 8, 2025 Orders (DE 45 , 51), expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, extend rule 4(m) deadline, recuse Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields, stay proceedings, and schedule conference by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025) Court ignored issuing new Summons for New Defendants.
07/15/2025	72	COPY OF 71 Letter MOTION to Vacate July 8, 2025 Orders (DE 45 , 51), expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, extend rule 4(m) deadline, recuse Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields, stay proceedings, and schedule conference by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/16/2025	69	RESPONSE to Motion re 67 MOTION to Vacate DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline, 68 Amended MOTION to Vacate DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/16/2025	73	REPLY to Response to Motion re 69 Response to Motion, AND request for adjournment of motions to dismiss (DE 61 , 62) and Plaintiff's opposition to July 21, 2025 substitution of Dara Clarke, issuance of summonses, extension of rule 4(m) deadline, and recusal of District Judge Bulsara and Magistrate Judge Shields - service writ of mandamus filed 7/16/2025. filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/17/2025)
07/18/2025		ORDER: The motion to vacate 67 68 is denied. Plaintiff's motion is, in essence, a motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order on June 23, 2025. (See Order dated June 23, 2025). Local Civil Rule 6.3 governs motions for reconsideration. It provides, "a notice of motion for reconsideration must be served within 14 days after the entry of the court's order being challenged." More than 14 days have passed since the Court's Order. Additionally, motions for reconsideration may only be sought once. Plaintiff has already moved for reconsideration, (see Mot. for Reconsideration dated June 24, 2025, Dkt. No. 65), and the Court denied the motion. (See Order dated July 1, 2025). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/18/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 07/18/2025)
07/21/2025	74	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss by Lidia M. Orrego (NF) (Entered: 07/22/2025)
07/21/2025	75	NOTICE from Lidia Orrego RE: Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Motion for Permission to Appeal In Forma Pauperis, and Certificate of Service, submitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on 7/16/2025 (Attachments: # 1 Part 2, # 2 Part 3, # 3 Part 4) (NF) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/23/2025	76	Letter confirming Plaintiff's Opposition to the Pasternack Firm's motion to dismiss was received on July 21, 2025 by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/23/2025	77	Letter confirming service of Plaintiff's opposition to motion to dismiss by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/28/2025		ORDER denying 67 Motion to Vacate ; denying 68 Motion to Vacate ; denying 71 Motion to Vacate. Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration are DENIED. The Court affirms its July 8, 2025 ruling. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to August 5, 2025 to effectuate service of process is GRANTED. Plaintiff's request for recusal of the undersigned is DENIED. The court construes Plaintiff's request to substitute Dara Clarke as a request for permission to make a motion for substitution. Such request is GRANTED. The following briefing schedule regarding the motion for substitution is now in effect: Plaintiff shall serve her motion on Defendants and non-parties by August 29, 2025. Defendants and non-parties shall serve their opposition on Plaintiff by September 29, 2025. Plaintiff shall serve her reply on Defendants and non-parties by October 14, 2025. Each side shall file their papers on ECF. Counsel are reminded that the undersigned employs the "bundle" rule. Therefore, no papers shall be filed on ECF until the motion is fully-briefed. Counsel are further reminded that there is a 25 page limit and that footnotes are strongly discouraged and should be used sparingly. Defendants are directed to provide a courtesy copy of the entire fully-briefed motion to this Court on or before October 20, 2025. In accord with Rule 1(E) of this Court's Individual Rules, counsel is reminded that all copies must be marked "courtesy copy" "original filed ECF" and that courtesy copies of exhibits and appendices must be clearly labeled and tabbed. Voluminous documents should be submitted in clearly tabbed binders and should not be "velobound." So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/28/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/28/2025)
07/28/2025		ORDER granting 55 Motion for Hearing; granting 58 Motion for Pre Motion Conference; granting 60 Motion for Hearing; granting in part and denying in part 64 Motion for Sanctions. A conference regarding the motions for sanctions has been scheduled for November 10, 2025 at 11:00 AM in courtroom 840 of the Central Islip courthouse. All parties should be prepared to argue their positions. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/28/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/28/2025)
07/29/2025	78	Letter MOTION to Vacate Objection to District Judge Sanket J. Bulsara's Order Dated July 18, 2025 and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields' Order Dated July 28, 2025; Request to Vacate Orders of July 10 and July 28 Under FRCP 54 (b) for Intentional Misrepresentation and Unauthorized Exercise of Jurisdiction; Request for Recusal of Both Judges Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) & (b)(1) for Permitting Improper Delegation of Dispositive Authority, Demonstrated Bias, and Alleged Conspiracy to Deprive Rights Under 18 U.S.C. § 241 by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/29/2025)
08/02/2025	79	Letter MOTION to Compel Motion and Objection to Vacate Improperly Issued July 18, 2025 Summons, to Correct the Caption, and for a 30-day extension to serve, with relief requested under FRCP 60(b), 54(b), 25(a), and 28 U.S.C. § 455

21

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

		by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/04/2025)
08/04/2025	80	Letter MOTION to Compel <i>Vacate Order Dated July 28, 2025, Pursuant to FRCP 54(b) and Local Civil Rule 6.3; to Reaffirm Judicial Recusal Requests; and to Seek Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief to Prevent Manifest Injustice, based on Evidence Submitted by the New York State Attorney General Letitia James</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/05/2025) Court ignored issuing new Summons for New Defendants and EXTENTION TIME
08/08/2025	81	MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum in Support, # 2 Declaration, # 3 Exhibit Complaint, # 4 Exhibit Defendants' Motion for Pre-Motion Conference, # 5 Exhibit Plaintiff's Letter Motion, # 6 Exhibit Amended Complaint, # 7 Exhibit Unpublished Decisions, # 8 Certificate of Service) (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	82	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>from pro se plaintiff Lidia Orrego</i> , RESPONSE to Motion re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>from Lidia Orrego in response to First Choice and Dr. Hochfelder's motion to dismiss</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Audio files to be produced under separate cover) (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	83	REPLY in Support re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	84	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>and in reply</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Memo of Law in Opposition, # 2 Exhibit B - Affirmation in Opposition) (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/11/2025		ORDER: First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD's memorandum of law in support of their motion to dismiss 81 and their reply memorandum of law 83 fail to comply with Local Rule 7.1, which requires a certificate of compliance with the word limits in either the Local Rules or Judge Bulsara's Individual Practices, and "must state the number of words in the document." See Local Civil Rule 7.1(c); Judge Bulsara's Individual Practices § VI(E). First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD are directed to file the certificates for their two memoranda of law by 8/18/2025. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 8/11/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	85	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>word count certification pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(c)</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	86	REPLY in Support re 83 Reply in Support <i>word count certification pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(c)</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	87	Letter MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>File Supplemental Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Address Biased Order of Hon. John C.V. Katsanos; Non-Waiver Pendeng Recusal Requests Motions; and to Seek Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief to Prevent Manifest Injustice, Based on Evidence Submitted by the New York State Attorney General Letitia James</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	88	Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	89	MEMORANDUM in Support <i>Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	90	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re 88 Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - WCB Decision, # 2 Exhibit B - Letter, # 3 Exhibit C - Third Dept COA Memo & Order, # 4 Exhibit D - Third Dept COA Orders, # 5 Exhibit E - Short Form Order, # 6 Exhibit F - Letter, # 7 Exhibit G - Short Form Order, # 8 Exhibit H - Letter, # 9 Exhibit I - Order on Application, # 10 Exhibit J - Amended Complaint in Legal Malpractice Action, # 11 Exhibit K - Complaint in 736) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	91	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Opposition re 88 Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint (Plaintiff's Opposition)</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # 1 Affidavit in Opposition Part 2 of 3, # 2 Affidavit in Opposition Part 3 of 3) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	92	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim , 83 Reply in Support (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	93	REPLY in Support of <i>Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	94	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re 88 Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint Reply Declaration In Further Support of Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit L - Decision & Order of Judge Katsanos) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	95	Letter to Judge Bulsara re <i>Service of Reply and Courtesy Copies</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)

8/17/25, 7:46 AM

Eastern District of New York - LIVE Database 1.8 (Revision 1.8.1)

08/11/2025	96	Letter to Judge Bulsara re Service of Courtesy Copies by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	97	Follow-Up and CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss by Lidia M. Orrego (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/12/2025	98	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD re 81 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim , 83 Reply in Support (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/12/2025	99	Letter Re Plaintiff's request to file sur-reply by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/12/2025	100	Letter re Plaintiff's request to file sur-reply by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/13/2025	101	Emergency MOTION for Hearing to Strike Scandalous and Improper DE 93 and DE 94 ; Notice of Non-Waiver of Recusal Motions (DE 78 , DE 79) by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/14/2025)
08/14/2025	102	ORDER: The motions 78 79 80 are denied for the reasons stated in the attached, and Plaintiff is enjoined from making additional filings in this case, absent court order, and as set forth in the attached filing injunction. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 8/14/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 08/14/2025)

Court ignored issuing new Summons for New Defendants - EXTENTION TIME.

PACER Service Center

Order Violation Due Process



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Affirmation of Service

23cv6507 (SJB) (AYS)

Pasternack Tilker Zieegler Walsh
Stanton & Romano LLP, et al.

Defendants.
_____x

I, Lidia M. Orrego, declare under penalty of perjury that I served a copy of the attached Request for Leave to File MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION of Incomprehensible and Impracticable Orders by J. Bulsara and Shields on NEW DEFENDANTS, Requesting NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS and Extension of Time to Serve per DE [78], [79], [80] dated August 20, 2025, upon the Defendant(s) or attorney whose physical address:

Via ECF & Notice has been electronically mailed

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP

100 Park Avenue, Suite 2000

New York, New York 10017

Phone: 862-682-7246

Andrew I. Hamelsky, Esq.: ahamelsky@stradley.com

Jenifer A. Scarcella, Esq.: jscarcella@stradley.com

Attorney for Defendants First Choice Evaluations, LLC and Dr. Jason Hochfelder

Rivkin Radler LLP

926 RXR Plaza Uniondale

New York 11556

Phone: 516-357-3000

David Wilck, Esq.: david.wilck@rivkin.com

Jason M. Biegel Esq.: jason.biegel@rivkin.com

Attorneys for Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton &
Romano LLP and Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: August 20, 2025
Rego Park, New York

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego

Plaintiff - Pro Se
Address: 95-08 Queens Blvd. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
Phone (347) 4532234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

EXHIBIT 5

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Brenna B. Mahoney
Clerk of Court

August Marziliano
Chief Deputy, Brooklyn

Ogoro Francis-McLeish
Chief Deputy, Central Islip



Theodore Roosevelt Federal Courthouse
Emanuel Celler Federal Courthouse
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 613-2270

Alfonse D'Amato Federal Courthouse
100 Federal Plaza
Central Islip, NY 11722
(631) 712-6000
Pro Se: (631) 712-6060

Lidia M. Orrego
95-08 Queens Blvd
Apt 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374

September 18, 2025

RE: 20-cv-3361-SJB-AYS; 23-cv-6507-SJB-AYS and 24-cv-7247-SJB-AYS

Dear Ms. Orrego,

The enclosed documents are being returned without docketing or consideration for the following reason(s):

- () The docket number and judge's initials are missing.
- () Your signature is required on all papers filed with the Court. Please sign wherever an "X" appears.
- () These papers appear to be intended for another court or agency.
- (X) Other: Pursuant to the enclosed electronic orders So Ordered by District Judge Bulsara on 9/16/2025 "The Clerk's Office is directed to return all of this material via first-class mail to Plaintiff."

Date: 09/18/2025

BRENNNA B. MAHONEY
CLERK OF COURT

By: /s/ Pro Se Department

Enclosures: *Electronic order So Ordered by District Judge Bulsara on 9/16/2025 on cases 20-cv-3361-SJB-AYS; 23-cv-6507-SJB-AYS and 24-cv-7247-SJB-AYS;*
Pro Se Electronic Portal submission for 23cv6507 stamped 11:40 am, 21 Aug. 2025 (15 pages printed double sided);
Pro Se Electronic Portal submission for 20cv3361 stamped 10:53 am, 09 Sep, 2025 (229 pages printed double sided);
Pro Se Electronic Portal submission for 20cv3361 stamped 10:23 PM, 15 Sep, 2025 (4 pages printed double sided);
Pro Se Electronic Portal submission for 20cv3361 stamped 1:36 PM, 15 Sep, 2025 (1137 pages printed double sided with 4 pages per side)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Affirmation of Service

23cv6507 (SJB) (AYS)

Pasternack Tilker Ziecgler Walsh
Stanton & Romano LLP, et al.

Defendants.

I, Lidia M. Orrego, declare under penalty of perjury that I served a copy of Letter Motion Leave to file, Notice of Appeal Order Dated September 16, 2025, Informational Statement and Exhibits 1-5 attached, Application IFP (37-Page) Dated September 30, 2025 upon the Defendant(s) or attorney whose physical address:

Via ECF & Notice has been electronically mailed

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP

100 Park Avenue, Suite 2000

New York, New York 10017

Phone: 862-682-7246

Andrew I. Hamelsky, Esq.: ahamelsky@stradley.com

Jenifer A. Scarcella, Esq.: jscarcella@stradley.com

Attorney for Defendants First Choice Evaluations, LLC and Dr. Jason Hochfelder

Rivkin Radler LLP

926 RXR Plaza Uniondale

New York 11556

Phone: 516-357-3000

David Wilck, Esq.: david.wilck@rivkin.com

Jason M. Biegel Esq.: jason.biegel@rivkin.com

Attorneys for Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton &
Romano LLP and Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: September 30, 2025
Rego Park, New York

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego

Plaintiff - Pro Se
Address: 95-08 Queens Blvd. 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
Phone (347) 4532234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

APPEAL,NPROSE,PROSENEF

**U.S. District Court
Eastern District of New York (Central Islip)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS**

Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano
LLP et al

Assigned to: Judge Sanket J. Bulsara
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields

related Cases: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS

2:25-cv-00736-SJB-AYS

2:25-cv-00769-SJB-AYS

2:24-cv-07247-SJB-AYS

Cause: 18:1964 Racketeering (RICO) Act

Plaintiff

Lidia M. Orrego

represented by **Lidia M. Orrego**
95-08 Queens Blvd
Apt 3E
Rego Park, NY 11374
347-453-2234
Email: liorrego@gmail.com
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

**Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh
Stanton & Romano LLP**

represented by **David Stephen Wilck**
Rivkin Radler LLP
926 Rexcorp Plaza
Uniondale, NY 11556
516-357-3000
Fax: 516-357-3000
Email: david.wilck@rivkin.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jason M. Biegel
Rivkin Radler LLP
926 RXR Plaza
Uniondale, NY 11556
516-357-3000
Email: jason.biegel@rivkin.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

**Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg
LLP**

represented by **David Stephen Wilck**
(See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jason M. Biegel
(See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

First Choice Evaluations LLC

represented by **Andrew Hamelsky**
Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP
101 Park Avenue
Suite 2000
New York, NY 10019
212-404-0636

Email: ahamelsky@stradley.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jenifer Ann Scarcella
White & Williams LLP
One Penn Plaza
250 W 34th Street, Suite 4110
New York, NY 10119
212-714-3064
Fax: 212-868-4841
Email: jscarcella@stradley.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Jason Hochfelder MD

represented by **Andrew Hamelsky**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jenifer Ann Scarcella
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

John Doe

Defendant

Jane Doe

Defendant

Ginu Jacob, Esq.
Associate

Defendant

Sam Cohen, Esq.
Associate

Defendant

Joseph Mercurio, Esq.
Associate

Defendant

Andrew Ziemianski, Esq.
Associate

Defendant

Matthew Funk, Esq.
Associate

Defendant

Mariana Vizuite
Paralegal-Associate

Defendant

Lewis Heller, Esq.
Associate

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
08/31/2023	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT against All Defendants Was the Disclosure Statement on Civil Cover Sheet completed –No., filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibits, # <u>2</u> Civil Cover Sheet) (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>2</u>	Summons Issued as to First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>3</u>	FILING FEE: \$ 402.00, receipt number 100009206 (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>4</u>	In accordance with Rule 73 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 73.1, the parties are notified that if all parties consent a United States magistrate judge of this court is available to conduct all proceedings in this civil action including a (jury or nonjury) trial and to order the entry of a final judgment. Attached to the Notice is a blank copy of the consent form that should be filled out, signed and filed electronically only if all parties wish to consent. The form may also be accessed at the following link: http://www.uscourts.gov/uscourts/FormsAndFees/Forms/AO085.pdf . You may withhold your consent without adverse substantive consequences. Do NOT return or file the consent unless all parties have signed the consent. (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>5</u>	Notice of Related Case: 20-cv-3361-JMA-AYS The Civil Cover Sheet filed in this civil action indicates a related case. (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>6</u>	Pro Se Consent to Electronic Notification by Lidia M. Orrego (DC) (Entered: 08/31/2023)
08/31/2023	<u>8</u>	Corrected Summons Reissued as to First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (LF) (Entered: 09/05/2023)
09/01/2023	<u>7</u>	Updated Civil Cover Sheet. (LF) (Entered: 09/01/2023)
09/08/2023	<u>9</u>	ORDER: On August 31, 2023, Lidia Orrego ("Plaintiff"), acting pro se, filed a complaint together with the filing fee and summonses were issued. (ECF Nos. <u>1</u> – <u>3</u> .) Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. Accordingly, if service is not made upon the defendants by November 29, 2023, or Plaintiff fails to show good cause why such service has not been effected, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiff is to provide a copy of this Order to the defendants along with the summonses and complaint and shall file proof of service with the Court within fourteen (14) days of service. Plaintiff is required to advise the Clerk of Court of any changes of address. Failure to keep the Court informed of Plaintiff's current address may result in dismissal of the case. So Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 9/8/2023. c/ecf (LC) (Entered: 09/08/2023)
09/09/2023	<u>10</u>	Letter MOTION to Compel / <i>Plaintiff Requests clarification and alternative solution to comply with the Order ECF doc. 9</i> filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) Modified on 9/11/2023 to correct file date (LC). (Entered: 09/11/2023)
10/02/2023	<u>15</u>	SUMMONS Returned Executed by Lidia M. Orrego. First Choice Evaluations LLC served on 9/22/2023, answer due 10/13/2023; Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP served on 9/22/2023, answer due 10/13/2023; Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP served on 9/22/2023, answer due 10/13/2023. (LJ) (Entered: 10/11/2023)
10/02/2023	<u>16</u>	Summons Returned Unexecuted by Lidia M. Orrego as to Jason Hochfelder MD. (LJ) (Entered: 10/11/2023)
10/09/2023	<u>11</u>	NOTICE of Appearance by Andrew Hamelsky on behalf of First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (aty to be noticed) (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 10/09/2023)

		10/09/2023)
10/09/2023	<u>12</u>	NOTICE of Appearance by Jenifer Ann Scarcella on behalf of First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (aty to be noticed) (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 10/09/2023)
10/10/2023	<u>13</u>	MOTION for pre motion conference by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 10/10/2023)
10/10/2023	<u>14</u>	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 10/10/2023)
10/11/2023	<u>23</u>	SUMMONS Returned Executed by Lidia M. Orrego. Jason Hochfelder MD served on 9/26/2023, answer due 10/17/2023. (LC) (Entered: 10/18/2023)
10/12/2023	<u>17</u>	NOTICE of Appearance by Jason M. Biegel on behalf of Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (aty to be noticed) (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 10/12/2023)
10/12/2023	<u>18</u>	NOTICE of Appearance by David Stephen Wilck on behalf of Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (aty to be noticed) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 10/12/2023)
10/12/2023	<u>26</u>	Letter dated 10/12/2023 from Lidia Orrego to Judge Azrack re Plaintiff's request for Defendants' Authentication or Identification of Evidence under FRCP and Evidence Rules before filing her response to ECF doc. <u>13</u> and future pleadings. (LF) (Entered: 10/27/2023)
10/13/2023	<u>19</u>	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 10/13/2023)
10/16/2023	<u>20</u>	Letter by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 10/16/2023)
10/16/2023	<u>21</u>	Letter <i>re follow up to the Firm's pre-motion letter</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Wilck, David) (Entered: 10/16/2023)
10/16/2023	<u>22</u>	LETTER dated 10/16/2023 from Lidia Orrego to Judge Azrack re "Plaintiff's request for Defendants' Authentication or Identification of Evidence under FRCP and Evidence Rules before filing her response to ECF doc. <u>19</u> and future pleadings." (LC) (Entered: 10/17/2023)
10/16/2023	<u>24</u>	Plaintiff's Response and Opposition to Defendants' Letter ECF Id. <u>13</u> for an order to file a Motion to Dismiss filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 10/26/2023)
10/17/2023	<u>25</u>	Plaintiff's Response and Opposition to Defendants' Letter ECF Id. <u>19</u> for an order to file a Motion to Dismiss filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 10/26/2023)
10/26/2023	<u>27</u>	MOTION for leave to allow Pro Se to Electronically File by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF) (Entered: 10/27/2023)
10/30/2023		ORDER. Before the Court is the voluminous October 12, 2023 submission from <u>pro se</u> plaintiff Lidia Orrego via Box.com, DE <u>26</u> . Notably, apart from the two-page letter to the Court, the additional 356 pages appear to be documentary discovery that does not comply with the Local Rules of this Court. <u>See</u> Local Civil Rule 5.1. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court shall docket only the first two pages of this submission and shall delete the balance of Plaintiff's submission from Box.com. Plaintiff is cautioned that document submission via Box.com is a privilege but may be revoked if abused. Should Plaintiff continue to upload lengthy submissions in contravention of the Court's rules, she may be required to file papers in hard copy via the mail and/or in person. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB) (Entered: 10/30/2023)
10/30/2023		ORDER denying <u>27</u> Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File. Before the Court is an application from <u>pro se</u> Plaintiff Lidia Orrego seeking permission for electronic case filing via the Court's Electronic Case filing system ("ECF"). The

		application is denied without prejudice. Plaintiff has demonstrated her ability to upload and submit documents utilizing the Court's electronic mailbox, Box.com, and her submissions have promptly been uploaded to the public docket where appropriate. However, Plaintiff's frequent uploading of voluminous and/or improper documents on Box.com gives the Court pause. In the absence of Plaintiff alleging any prejudice as a result of the current system, her application is denied without prejudice. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB) (Entered: 10/30/2023)
11/01/2023		ORDER: The Court waives the pre-motion conference requirement for Defendants' anticipated motions to dismiss and accordingly DENIES Defendants' pre-motion conference requests for those motions at DEs <u>13</u> and <u>19</u>. Defendants shall serve (but not file) their motions to dismiss by 12/1/2023, Plaintiff shall serve (but not file) her opposition papers by 1/19/2024, and Defendants shall serve their reply papers by 2/7/2024. Defendants shall <i>file</i> all motion papers on 2/7/2024. <u>See</u> District Judge Joan M. Azrack's Individual Practice Rule ("Rule") IV.G.2. The parties are reminded that memoranda of law in support of, and in opposition to, motions are limited to 25 pages, and reply memoranda are limited to 15 pages. <u>See</u> Rule IV.C. Defendants shall comply with their obligation under Local Civil Rule 7.2 to provide Plaintiff with copies of authorities Defendants cite that are "unpublished or reported exclusively on computerized databases." Plaintiff's motion at DE <u>10</u> seeking "clarification" regarding anticipated service of process is DENIED AS MOOT given that proof of service was subsequently filed. <u>See</u> DE <u>15</u>. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 11/1/2023. (CB) (Entered: 11/01/2023)
11/14/2023		ORDER. Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego ("Plaintiff") has filed two separate actions in this court (20-CV-3361 and 23-CV-6507), each arising from or relating to her former employment with the defendants in 20-CV-3361. On August 3, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Interlocutory Appeal in 20-CV-3361 seeking review of this Court's July 11, 2023 and July 20, 2023 Orders. (<u>See</u> 23-1114 (2d Cir. Aug. 4, 2023)). Of note, the July 11, 2023 Order denied Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration, to set aside, and to vacate Judge Brown's Order adopting the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Shields that denied Plaintiff's motion for a declaratory judgment and to change venue. Plaintiff had already made similar motions which Judge Brown denied by Order dated March 28, 2023 where he warned: "PLAINTIFF IS CAUTIONED ONCE AGAIN THAT THE CONTINUED FILING OF BLOATED AND WHOLLY UNSUPPORTED MOTIONS MAY SUBJECT HER TO THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS FOR ENGAGING IN FRIVOLOUS LITIGATION CONDUCT UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1927." Undeterred, Plaintiff has continued to file voluminous, repetitive, and unsupported motions in both of her cases. Indeed, since Judge Brown's March 28, 2023 warning, Plaintiff has filed an additional 26 motions in 20-CV-3361 alone, including a motion to certify an interlocutory appeal which this Court denied by Order dated July 28, 2023. Further, on October 31, 2023, Plaintiff has filed a 151-page "Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, Certiorari, and Prohibition" against the undersigned and Magistrate Judge Shields in the Second Circuit complaining of conduct alleged to have occurred in 20-CV-3361. <u>See</u> 23-7643 (2d Cir. Oct. 31, 2023). Accordingly, given Plaintiff's pending appeals and in an abundance of caution in light of her <u>pro se</u> status, the Court STAYS these matters pending resolution of the appeals. To be clear, Plaintiff SHALL NOT file any additional papers in either 20-CV-3361 or 23-CV-6507 and any submissions received via box.com, in person at the Clerks Office, or through the mail will not be considered or docketed. Plaintiff also SHALL NOT continue to contact the undersigned's chambers. Further, any papers the Clerk has received since August 3, 2023 in each case that have not yet been docketed shall be returned to Plaintiff. If any such filing exceeds 5 pages, the Clerk of the Court shall reference the returned document in a return letter and include only the first page of such submission. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and therefore <u>in forma pauperis</u> status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. <u>See Coppedge v. United States</u>, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 11/14/2023. (JSB) (Entered: 11/14/2023)
11/14/2023	<u>28</u>	Letter from Pro Se Office to pro se plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego: Pursuant to Judge Azrack's Electronic Order dated November 14, 2023, the enclosed documents are being returned to you without docketing or consideration. (LF) (Entered: 11/14/2023)

11/17/2023	<u>29</u>	LETTER dated 11/17/2023 from Pro Se Office to Lidia M. Orrego. Pursuant to Judge Azrack's Electronic Order dated November 14, 2023, the enclosed documents are being returned to you without docketing or consideration. As Judge Azrack instructed, we have enclosed the first page of your submissions. (LC) (Entered: 11/20/2023)
11/29/2023	<u>30</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File and Order by Lidia M. Orrego. (CL) (Main Document 30 replaced on 11/29/2023) (CL). (Entered: 11/29/2023)
11/29/2023	<u>31</u>	USCA Appeal Fees received \$ 505 receipt number 200002639 re <u>30</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego (CL) (Entered: 11/29/2023)
11/29/2023		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>30</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (CL) (Entered: 11/29/2023)
11/29/2023		First Supplemental Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>30</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal: Document replaced on docket. Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (CL) Modified on 11/29/2023 (CL). (Entered: 11/29/2023)
02/21/2024	<u>32</u>	LETTER dated 2/21/2024 from Lidia Orrego to Judge Azrack Re: Interlocutory Appeal Docket 23-1114 under 28 U.S.C. § 1292 erroneously denied under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (final order). The case should remain stayed according to the order dated November 14, 2023, until the motion pending at the Court of Appeals Second Circuit is granted and the Plaintiff receives the filing fee reimbursement according to the law NY General Business Law § 349 and the case will continue after the pending resolution of the Interlocutory Appeal in 20-CV-3361 seeking a review of this Court's July 11, 2023, and July 20, 2023. (LC) (Entered: 02/21/2024)
02/27/2024		ORDER. On February 21, 2021, Plaintiff, using Box.com, filed an 18-page letter bearing only district court docket number 23-CV-6507(JMA)(AYS) and appellate court docket number 23-1114, wherein Plaintiff requests that the district court case "remain as stay[ed] according to the order dated November 14, 2023." <u>See</u> ECF No. 32 in 23-6507. By Electronic Order dated November 14, 2023, this Court "STAY[ED]" these matters [23-CV-6507 and 20-CV-3361] pending resolution of the appeals" and made "clear [that] Plaintiff SHALL NOT file any additional papers in either 20-CV-3361 or 23-CV-6507 and any submissions received via Box.com, in person at the Clerks Office, or through the mail will not be considered or docketed." <u>See</u> Elec. Order, dated November 14, 2023. Given that the stay has not been lifted, her letter is improper and should not have been accepted by the Clerk of the Court. Rather than return it, Plaintiff is reminded that no further filings shall be made in these cases until her Interlocutory Appeals in both cases are resolved. The Clerk of the Court is directed to return any such filings to Plaintiff without docketing or consideration. The Court is aware that, by Mandate issued on February 13, 2024, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed the Interlocutory Appeal filed in 20-CV-3361. <u>See</u> ECF No. 180 in 20-CV-3361. However, the Interlocutory Appeal filed in 23-CV-6507 remains pending. <u>See</u> ECF No. 30 in 23-CV-6507. Plaintiff shall file a letter not exceeding three pages requesting that the stay be lifted upon resolution of the remaining interlocutory appeal. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and therefore <u>in forma pauperis</u> status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. <u>See Coppedge v. United States</u> , 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 2/27/2024. (JSB) (Entered: 02/27/2024)
05/15/2024	<u>33</u>	MANDATE of USCA as to <u>30</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego. This Court has sua sponte determined that it lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the districtcourt has not issued a final order as contemplated by 28 U.S.C. § 1291. <u>See Petrello v. White</u> , 533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the appealis DISMISSED. (CL) (Entered: 05/15/2024)
12/06/2024	<u>34</u>	Notice of Related Cases: 20-cv-3361-JMA-AYS and 24-cv-7247-JMA-AYS The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case. (DC) (Entered: 12/06/2024)

12/19/2024		Email Notification Test – DO NOT REPLY (GO) (Entered: 12/19/2024)
01/31/2025		Case reassigned to Judge Sanket J. Bulsara. Judge Joan M. Azrack no longer assigned to the case. Please download and review the Individual Practices of the assigned Judges, located on our website . Attorneys are responsible for providing courtesy copies to judges where their Individual Practices require such. (LF) (Entered: 01/31/2025)
02/06/2025	<u>35</u>	MOTION to Compel <i>Re: Plaintiffs Request to Lift the Stays in the 2020 and 2023 Cases and Reinstate Motions</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 02/06/2025)
02/10/2025		ORDER: The motion to lift the stay <u>35</u> is granted. Any future motions must comply with the Individual Practices of the undersigned and the Local Rules effective January 2, 2025. Any non-dispositive matters, including any discovery matters, are to be directed to Magistrate Judge Shields. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 2/10/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 02/10/2025)
02/11/2025	<u>36</u>	Proposed MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>re Request for Briefing Schedule</i> by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 02/11/2025)
02/11/2025	<u>37</u>	RESPONSE to Motion re <u>36</u> Proposed MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>re Request for Briefing Schedule The Pasternack Firm Joins the Application to Request an Updated Briefing Schedule</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 02/11/2025)
02/12/2025	<u>38</u>	Notice of Related Case: 25-cv-00736 The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case. (KS) (Entered: 02/12/2025)
02/12/2025		ORDER: Defendants are directed to meet and confer with the Plaintiff to jointly propose a briefing schedule for their respective motions to dismiss by 2/26/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 2/12/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 02/12/2025)
02/14/2025	<u>39</u>	Notice of Related Case: 25-cv-00769 The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case. (KS) (Entered: 02/14/2025)
02/25/2025	<u>40</u>	Letter <i>with joint proposed briefing schedule for Defendants' respective motions to dismiss</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 02/25/2025)
02/26/2025		ORDER: The Court adopts the parties' proposed briefing schedule <u>40</u> for Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and Defendants' respective motions to dismiss. If Plaintiff chooses to amend, Plaintiff must submit an Amended Complaint for filing and forward a copy of the Amended Complaint to Defendants' counsel via email by 3/20/2025 . Defendants must serve, but not file, their respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email and file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket by 4/23/2025 . Plaintiff must serve, but not file, her opposition to Defendants' respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Defendants' counsel via email by 5/21/2025 . Defendants' counsel must file proof of service of Plaintiff's opposition upon Defendants by 5/23/2025 . Defendants must serve their respective replies in further support of their motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email; file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket; file Defendants' respective moving papers in support of their motions to dismiss, Plaintiff's opposition, and Defendants' respective replies; and forward courtesy copies of each Memoranda of Law in support and opposition to the Court, all by 6/11/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 2/26/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 02/26/2025)
03/21/2025	<u>41</u>	AMENDED COMPLAINT against Jane Doe, John Doe, First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Ginu Jacob, Esq., Sam Cohen, Esq., Joseph Mercurio, Esq., Andrew Ziemianski, Esq., Matthew Funk, Esq., Mariana Vizuete, Lewis Heller, Esq., filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 03/21/2025)
04/10/2025	<u>42</u>	Letter from Pro Se Litigant Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Bulsara, dated 4/10/25 Re: Subject: Acknowledgment of Amended Complaint and Waiver of Additional Service (GO) (Entered: 04/10/2025)

04/11/2025	<u>43</u>	Letter MOTION to Compel <i>that Counsel Accept Service and for New Scheduling Order</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 04/11/2025)
04/11/2025	<u>44</u>	RESPONSE to Motion re <u>43</u> Letter MOTION to Compel <i>that Counsel Accept Service and for New Scheduling Order</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 04/11/2025)
04/15/2025		ORDER: The Court declines the request <u>44</u> of counsel for the appearing Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano, LLP and Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LL to delay briefing on any motion to dismiss until conclusion of service on any new Defendant. As such, the Court adopts Plaintiff's proposed briefing schedule <u>43</u> for all appearing Defendants' motions to dismiss: Defendants must serve, but not file, their respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email and file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket by 6/20/2025 . Plaintiff must serve, but not file, her opposition to Defendants' respective motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Defendants' counsel via email by 7/21/2025 . Defendants' counsel must file proof of service of Plaintiff's opposition upon Defendants by 7/23/2025 . Defendants must serve their respective replies in further support of their motions to dismiss by forwarding a copy to Plaintiff via physical mail and email; file proof of service upon Plaintiff on the docket; file Defendants' respective moving papers in support of their motions to dismiss, Plaintiff's opposition, and Defendants' respective replies; and forward courtesy copies of each Memoranda of Law in support and opposition to the Court, all by 8/11/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 4/15/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 04/15/2025)
05/06/2025	<u>45</u>	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis , MOTION to Vacate , MOTION for Sanctions , MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> , MOTION to Compel <i>Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/07/2025)
05/07/2025	<u>46</u>	RESPONSE to Motion re <u>45</u> MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel <i>Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 05/07/2025)
05/08/2025	<u>47</u>	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) service deadline from June 18, 2025, to July 18, 2025 and permission to proceed with my motion filed on May 6, 2025</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/08/2025)
05/08/2025	<u>48</u>	AFFIDAVIT of Service for DE <u>47</u> – Letter Motion Requesting Extension of Time for Rule 4(M) Service Deadline, Permission To Proceed with Motion for Relief (DE <u>45</u>) or For A Conference, and Reply To Defendants' Letter (DE <u>46</u>) served on Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP, and Rivkin Radler LLP, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/09/2025)
05/09/2025		ORDER: The Court denies Plaintiff Orrego's request <u>45</u> to vacate the Order from April 15, 2025, which granted an extension to the briefing schedule for Defendants' motions to dismiss. The deadlines in the briefing schedule will remain as previously ordered. As to Plaintiff's motion <u>47</u> filed May 8, 2025, the Court grants Plaintiff's request to proceed with her motion <u>45</u> filed May 6, 2025, but denies the request to reply to the response from Defendants Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP <u>46</u> . The Court respectfully refers all other matters in Plaintiff's requests which concern pretrial management for decision by Judge Shields. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 5/9/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 05/09/2025)
05/13/2025	<u>49</u>	RESPONSE to Motion re <u>45</u> MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel <i>Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 05/13/2025)

05/13/2025	<u>50</u>	MOTION to Compel <i>U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions</i> , MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/13/2025)
05/14/2025		ORDER denying <u>45</u> Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis; deferring ruling on <u>45</u> Motion for Sanctions; granting <u>45</u> Motion for Extension of Time to File; deferring ruling on <u>45</u> Motion to Compel; granting <u>47</u> Motion for Extension of Time to File; deferring ruling on <u>50</u> Motion to Compel; granting <u>50</u> Motion for Extension of Time to File. Plaintiff's applications are GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks an order directing the U.S. Marshals Service to serve the summons and Amended Complaint on Defendants, the motion is DENIED. Similarly, Plaintiff's request to serve Defendants by cost-reducing methods is likewise DENIED. Therefore, Plaintiff shall serve the summons and Amended Complaint in accord with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. However, Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to July 18, 2025 to effectuate service of process is GRANTED. The Court defers ruling on Plaintiff's requests seeking sanctions on defense counsel and an order directing Defendants' counsel to file a suggestion of death/substitution motion for defendant Lewis Heller, until defense counsel has submitted opposition to the requests. In that regard, by May 30, 2025, defense counsel shall submit opposition, if any, to Plaintiff's request for sanctions and request for an order directing counsel to file a substitution motion for defendant Lewis Heller. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 5/14/2025. (DM) (Entered: 05/14/2025)
05/28/2025	<u>51</u>	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,,,, Order on Motion for Extension of Time to File,,,,,, Order on Motion to Compel,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
05/30/2025	<u>52</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Opposition re <u>45</u> MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel <i>Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant</i> , <u>50</u> MOTION to Compel <i>U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions</i> MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Ex. A – Email Correspondence Exchanged by the parties, # <u>2</u> Ex. B – Judge Kerrigan's Order sanctioning Ms. Orrego, # <u>3</u> Ex. C – October 30, 2024 letter to Judge Kerrigan and related Order, # <u>4</u> Ex. D – Ms. Orrego's April 14 email, # <u>5</u> Ex. E – Amended Complaint in the Legal Malpractice Action, # <u>6</u> Ex. F – Motion to Dismiss in the Legal Malpractice Action, # <u>7</u> Ex. G – April 4 letter to Judge Katsanos in the Legal Malpractice Action re Heller's death) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
05/30/2025	<u>53</u>	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re <u>45</u> MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis MOTION to Vacate MOTION for Sanctions MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadline</i> MOTION to Compel <i>Defendants' Counsel to File Substitution Motion for deceased Defendant</i> , <u>50</u> MOTION to Compel <i>U.S. Marshal Service, compelling Substitution, Sanctions</i> MOTION for Extension of Time to File <i>Rule 4(m) Service Deadling</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 05/30/2025)
06/02/2025	<u>54</u>	REPLY to Response to Motion re <u>51</u> Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,,,, Order on Motion for Extension of Time to File,,,,,, Order on Motion to Compel,,, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/02/2025)
06/03/2025	<u>55</u>	REPLY in Opposition re <u>54</u> Reply to Response to Motion, <i>and Request for Conference</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) Modified to add a motion for hearing on 6/4/2025 (LF). (Entered: 06/03/2025)
06/03/2025	<u>56</u>	REPLY in Opposition to <u>55</u> REPLY in Opposition re: <u>54</u> Reply to Response to Motion, and Request for Conference, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/03/2025)
06/03/2025	<u>57</u>	AFFIDAVIT of Service for <u>56</u> Reply served on Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP and Rivkin Radler LLP on 6/3/2025, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/03/2025)

		06/03/2025)
06/13/2025	<u>58</u>	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/13/2025	<u>59</u>	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery / <i>Adjournment of the briefing schedule for Defendant's motion to dismiss</i> , by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/13/2025	<u>60</u>	Letter <i>Request for a Conference concerning ECF Document Nos. 58 and 59</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Biegel, Jason) Modified original letter entry into a motion on 6/16/2025 (LF). (Entered: 06/13/2025)
06/18/2025	<u>61</u>	Letter <i>confirming service of Motion to Dismiss</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Email to Plaintiff enclosing motion papers) (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/18/2025	<u>62</u>	Letter <i>confirming service of motion to dismiss on plaintiff</i> by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/18/2025	<u>63</u>	Letter from Lidia Orrego to Judge Bulsara dated 6/18/2025 Re: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, et al., Case No. 23-cv-6507-SJB-AYE Second Letter-Motion to Affirm No Waiver of Pending Motions, Request Expedited Ruling on DE <u>59</u> , Seek Further Adjournment, and Address Excessive Favoritism and Gross Ethical Violations. (NF) (Entered: 06/20/2025)
06/19/2025	<u>64</u>	Notice of MOTION for Sanctions <i>And to Defer Motions to Dismiss Before District Judge Sanket J. Bulsara</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/20/2025)
06/23/2025		ORDER: The motion for adjournment of the briefing schedule for Defendants' motion to dismiss <u>59</u> is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 6/23/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 06/23/2025)
06/24/2025	<u>65</u>	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery / <i>of Denial of Adjournment of Motion to Dismiss Briefing Schedule (DE 59)</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/24/2025)
06/24/2025	<u>66</u>	COPY OF <u>65</u> Letter MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery / <i>of Denial of Adjournment of Motion to Dismiss Briefing Schedule (DE 59)</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/24/2025)
07/01/2025		ORDER: Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration <u>65</u> is denied. Local Civil Rule 6.3 governs motions for reconsideration. It provides, "a notice of motion for reconsideration must be served within 14 days after the entry of the court's order being challenged. There must be served with the notice of motion a memorandum setting forth concisely the matters or controlling decisions which the moving party believes the court has overlooked." Reconsideration is "an extraordinary request that is granted only in rare circumstances, such as where the court failed to consider evidence or binding authority." <i>Van Buskirk v. United Grp. of Companies, Inc.</i>, 935 F.3d 49, 54 (2d Cir. 2019). "A motion for reconsideration should be granted only when the [moving party] identifies 'an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.'" <i>Kolel Beth Yechiel Mechil of Tartikov, Inc. v. YLL Irrevocable Tr.</i>, 729 F.3d 99, 104 (2d Cir. 2013) (quoting <i>Virgin Atl. Airways, Ltd. v. Nat'l Mediation Bd.</i>, 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992)). Plaintiff has failed to "point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court." <i>Id.</i> (quoting <i>Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.</i>, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995)). (See Mem. of Law in Supp. of Pl.'s Letter Mot. for Reconsideration dated June 24, 2025, Dkt. No. 65). This case has been pending for some time, and has not moved past its initial stages. Resolving the motions to dismiss will not prejudice Plaintiff's ability to serve any of the remaining parties and continue to litigate against them. The reasons proffered for further delay are without merit.

		Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration <u>65</u> is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/1/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 07/01/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER denying <u>51</u> Motion for Reconsideration. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is denied. The Court affirms its previous orders denying Plaintiff's request for an order directing the U.S. Marshals Service to serve the summons and Amended Complaint on Defendants. Similarly, the Court affirms its previous order denying Plaintiff's request to serve Defendants by cost-reducing methods. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/8/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER denying <u>45</u> Motion for Sanctions; denying <u>45</u> Motion to Compel; denying <u>50</u> Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's motion to compel substitution of Defendant Heller is DENIED. Plaintiff may move the Court to amend the complaint to reflect the proper party, or, as a party to this litigation, may move for substitution herself. Plaintiff's motion for sanctions is also DENIED. Plaintiff's conclusory allegations of bad faith do not constitute the granting of sanctions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 11 and 28 U.S.C. §1927. Additionally, <i>pro se</i> litigants are not entitled to recover sanctions in the form of costs for time spent litigating a dispute. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/8/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/15/2025	<u>67</u>	MOTION to Vacate <i>DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 07/15/2025)
07/15/2025	<u>68</u>	Amended MOTION to Vacate <i>DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 07/15/2025)
07/15/2025	<u>70</u>	Letter from Lidia Orrego to Judge Bulsara dated 7/15/2025 re: inquire about my inability to access or view my Letter Motion to Vacate, docketed as DE <u>68</u> (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/15/2025	<u>71</u>	Letter MOTION to Vacate <i>July 8, 2025 Orders (DE 45 , 51) , expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, extend rule 4(m) deadline, recuse Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields, stay proceedings, and schedule conference</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/15/2025	<u>72</u>	COPY OF <u>71</u> Letter MOTION to Vacate <i>July 8, 2025 Orders (DE 45, 51) , expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, extend rule 4(m) deadline, recuse Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields, stay proceedings, and schedule conference</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/16/2025	<u>69</u>	RESPONSE to Motion re <u>67</u> MOTION to Vacate <i>DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline</i> , <u>68</u> Amended MOTION to Vacate <i>DE 65 and expedite substitution, amend caption, issue new summons, and extend rule 4(m) deadline</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 07/16/2025)
07/16/2025	<u>73</u>	REPLY to Response to Motion re <u>69</u> Response to Motion, AND request for adjournment of motions to dismiss (DE <u>61</u> , <u>62</u>) and Plaintiff's opposition to July 21, 2025 substitution of Dara Clarke, issuance of summonses, extension of rule 4(m) deadline, and recusal of District Judge Bulsara and Magistrate Judge Shields – service writ of mandamus filed 7/16/2025. filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/17/2025)
07/18/2025		ORDER: The motion to vacate <u>67</u> <u>68</u> is denied. Plaintiff's motion is, in essence, a motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order on June 23, 2025. (See Order dated June 23, 2025). Local Civil Rule 6.3 governs motions for reconsideration. It provides, "a notice of motion for reconsideration must be served within 14 days after the entry of the court's order being challenged." More than 14 days have passed since the Court's Order. Additionally, motions for reconsideration may only be sought once. Plaintiff has already moved for reconsideration, (see Mot. for Reconsideration dated June 24, 2025, Dkt. No. 65), and the Court denied the motion. (See Order dated July 1, 2025). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/18/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 07/18/2025)

07/21/2025	<u>74</u>	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss by Lidia M. Orrego (NF) (Entered: 07/22/2025)
07/21/2025	<u>75</u>	NOTICE from Lidia Orrego RE: Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Motion for Permission to Appeal In Forma Pauperis, and Certificate of Service, submitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on 7/16/2025 (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2, # <u>2</u> Part 3, # <u>3</u> Part 4) (NF) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/23/2025	<u>76</u>	Letter <i>confirming Plaintiff's Opposition to the Pasternack Firm's motion to dismiss was received on July 21, 2025</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Biegel, Jason) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/23/2025	<u>77</u>	Letter <i>confirming service of Plaintiff's opposition to motion to dismiss</i> by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/28/2025		ORDER denying <u>67</u> Motion to Vacate ; denying <u>68</u> Motion to Vacate ; denying <u>71</u> Motion to Vacate. Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration are DENIED. The Court affirms its July 8, 2025 ruling. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to August 5, 2025 to effectuate service of process is GRANTED. Plaintiff's request for recusal of the undersigned is DENIED. The court construes Plaintiff's request to substitute Dara Clarke as a request for permission to make a motion for substitution. Such request is GRANTED. The following briefing schedule regarding the motion for substitution is now in effect: Plaintiff shall serve her motion on Defendants and non-parties by August 29, 2025. Defendants and non-parties shall serve their opposition on Plaintiff by September 29, 2025. Plaintiff shall serve her reply on Defendants and non-parties by October 14, 2025. Each side shall file their papers on ECF. Counsel are reminded that the undersigned employs the "bundle" rule. Therefore, no papers shall be filed on ECF until the motion is fully-briefed. Counsel are further reminded that there is a 25 page limit and that footnotes are strongly discouraged and should be used sparingly. Defendants are directed to provide a courtesy copy of the entire fully-briefed motion to this Court on or before October 20, 2025. In accord with Rule 1(E) of this Court's Individual Rules, counsel is reminded that all copies must be marked "courtesy copy" "original filed ECF" and that courtesy copies of exhibits and appendices must be clearly labeled and tabbed. Voluminous documents should be submitted in clearly tabbed binders and should not be "velobound." So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/28/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/28/2025)
07/28/2025		ORDER granting <u>55</u> Motion for Hearing; granting <u>58</u> Motion for Pre Motion Conference; granting <u>60</u> Motion for Hearing; granting in part and denying in part <u>64</u> Motion for Sanctions. A conference regarding the motions for sanctions has been scheduled for November 10, 2025 at 11:00 AM in courtroom 840 of the Central Islip courthouse. All parties should be prepared to argue their positions. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/28/2025. (DM) (Entered: 07/28/2025)
07/29/2025	<u>78</u>	Letter MOTION to Vacate <i>Objection to District Judge Sanket J. Bulsara's Order Dated July 18, 2025 and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields' Order Dated July 28, 2025; Request to Vacate Orders of July 10 and July 28 Under FRCP 54 (b) for Intentional Misrepresentation and Unauthorized Exercise of Jurisdiction; Request for Recusal of Both Judges Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) & (b)(1) for Permitting Improper Delegation of Dispositive Authority, Demonstrated Bias, and Alleged Conspiracy to Deprive Rights Under 18 U.S.C. § 241</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/29/2025)
08/02/2025	<u>79</u>	Letter MOTION to Compel <i>Motion and Objection to Vacate Improperly Issued July 18, 2025 Summons, to Correct the Caption, and for a 30-day extension to serve, with relief requested under FRCP 60(b), 54(b), 25(a), and 28 U.S.C. § 455</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/04/2025)
08/04/2025	<u>80</u>	Letter MOTION to Compel <i>Vacate Order Dated July 28, 2025, Pursuant to FRCP 54(b) and Local Civil Rule 6.3; to Reaffirm Judicial Recusal Requests; and to Seek Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief to Prevent Manifest Injustice, based on Evidence Submitted by the New York State Attorney General Letitia James</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/05/2025)
08/08/2025	<u>81</u>	MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Memorandum in Support, # <u>2</u> Declaration, #

		<u>3</u> Exhibit Complaint, # <u>4</u> Exhibit Defendants' Motion for Pre-Motion Conference, # <u>5</u> Exhibit Plaintiff's Letter Motion, # <u>6</u> Exhibit Amended Complaint, # <u>7</u> Exhibit Unpublished Decisions, # <u>8</u> Certificate of Service) (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	<u>82</u>	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>from pro se plaintiff Lidia Orrego</i> , RESPONSE to Motion re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>from Lidia Orrego in response to First Choice and Dr. Hochfelder's motion to dismiss</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit Audio files to be produced under separate cover) (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	<u>83</u>	REPLY in Support re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/08/2025	<u>84</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>and in reply</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A – Memo of Law in Opposition, # <u>2</u> Exhibit B – Affirmation in Opposition) (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/11/2025		ORDER: First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD's memorandum of law in support of their motion to dismiss <u>81</u> and their reply memorandum of law <u>83</u> fail to comply with Local Rule 7.1, which requires a certificate of compliance with the word limits in either the Local Rules or Judge Bulsara's Individual Practices, and "must state the number of words in the document." <i>See</i> Local Civil Rule 7.1(c); Judge Bulsara's Individual Practices § VI(E). First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD are directed to file the certificates for their two memoranda of law by 8/18/2025 . So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 8/11/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>85</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim <i>word count certification pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(c)</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>86</u>	REPLY in Support re <u>83</u> Reply in Support <i>word count certification pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(c)</i> filed by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD. (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>87</u>	Letter MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>File Supplemental Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and to Address Biased Order of Hon. John C.V. Katsanos; Non-Waiver Pendeng Recusal Requests Motions; and to Seek Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief to Prevent Manifest Injustice, Based on Evidence Submitted by the New York State Attorney General Letitia James</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>88</u>	Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>89</u>	MEMORANDUM in Support <i>Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>90</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re <u>88</u> Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A – WCB Decision, # <u>2</u> Exhibit B – Letter, # <u>3</u> Exhibit C – Third Dept COA Memo & Order, # <u>4</u> Exhibit D – Third Dept COA Orders, # <u>5</u> Exhibit E_ Short Form Order, # <u>6</u> Exhibit F – Letter, # <u>7</u> Exhibit G – Short Form Order, # <u>8</u> Exhibit H – Letter, # <u>9</u> Exhibit I – Order on Application, # <u>10</u> Exhibit J – Amended Complaint in Legal Malpractice Action, # <u>11</u> Exhibit K – Complaint in 736) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>91</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Opposition re <u>88</u> Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint (Plaintiff's Opposition)</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP.

		(Attachments: # <u>1</u> Affidavit in Opposition Part 2 of 3, # <u>2</u> Affidavit in Opposition Part 3 of 3) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>92</u>	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim , <u>83</u> Reply in Support (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>93</u>	REPLY in Support of <i>Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>94</u>	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re <u>88</u> Notice of MOTION to Dismiss <i>Amended Complaint Reply Declaration In Further Support of Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint</i> filed by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit L – Decision & Order of Judge Katsanos) (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>95</u>	Letter to Judge <i>Bulsara re Service of Reply and Courtesy Copies</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>96</u>	Letter to Judge <i>Bulsara re Service of Courtesy Copies</i> by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>97</u>	Follow-Up and CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss by Lidia M. Orrego (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/12/2025	<u>98</u>	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD re <u>81</u> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim , <u>83</u> Reply in Support (Hamelsky, Andrew) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/12/2025	<u>99</u>	Letter <i>Re Plaintiff's request to file sur-reply</i> by Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP (Wilck, David) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/12/2025	<u>100</u>	Letter <i>re Plaintiff's request to file sur-reply</i> by First Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder MD (Scarcella, Jenifer) (Entered: 08/12/2025)
08/13/2025	<u>101</u>	Emergency MOTION for Hearing to <i>Strike Scandalous and Improper DE 93 and DE 94 ; Notice of Non-Waiver of Recusal Motions (DE 78 , DE 79)</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/14/2025)
08/14/2025	<u>102</u>	ORDER: The motions <u>78</u> <u>79</u> <u>80</u> are denied for the reasons stated in the attached, and Plaintiff is enjoined from making additional filings in this case, absent court order, and as set forth in the attached filing injunction. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 8/14/2025. (YEP) (Entered: 08/14/2025)
08/20/2025	<u>103</u>	MOTION for Leave to File Document for <i>CLARIFICATION of Incomprehensible and Impracticable Orders</i> by J. Bulsara and Shields on <i>NEW DEFENDANTS, Requesting NEW SUMMONS FOR NEW DEFENDANTS and Extension of Time to Serve per DE 78 , 79 , 80</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/20/2025)
08/21/2025	<u>106</u>	MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION and ADJOURNMENT until Clarification of Shields' Order Dated 7/28/2025 Due to Lack of Specificity and Ambiguity Regarding UNSERVED NEW DEFENDANTS, Addition New Defendants vs. Substitution New Defendant</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 09/11/2025)
09/03/2025		ORDER denying <u>103</u> Motion for Leave to File. Plaintiff's request to file motions for clarification is denied. However, the Court clarifies that Plaintiff should obtain summonses in the same manner that Plaintiff has previously obtained summonses in the instant action, (see Docket Entry No. <u>2</u> , <u>8</u>), as well as other cases. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 9/3/2025. (DM) (Entered: 09/03/2025)
09/05/2025	<u>104</u>	Summons Issued as to Sam Cohen, Esq., Matthew Funk, Esq., Lewis Heller, Esq., Ginu Jacob, Esq., Joseph Mercurio, Esq., Mariana Vizuite, Andrew Ziemianski, Esq. (NF) (Entered: 09/05/2025)

09/06/2025	<u>105</u>	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File / of 30-day to Serve Summons, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 09/08/2025)
09/10/2025		ORDER granting <u>105</u> Motion for Extension of Time to File. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to serve the summonses is GRANTED. The summonses shall be served by October 10, 2025. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 9/10/2025. (DM) (Entered: 09/10/2025)
09/11/2025	<u>107</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to <u>102</u> Order on Motion to Vacate,, Order on Motion to Compel, by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/11/2025	<u>108</u>	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/15/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>107</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/16/2025	<u>109</u>	ORDER: On September 11, 2025, Lidia Orrego, acting pro se, filed a Notice of Interlocutory Appeal <u>107</u> of this Court's August 14, 2025 Order <u>102</u> , together with an application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> ("IFP") <u>108</u> . However, Orrego used the form application for IFP status in the district court rather than Form 4 of the Appellate Appendix of Forms. Upon review, it is apparent that the present application lacks the information required by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(1). Accordingly, the application to proceed IFP <u>108</u> is denied without prejudice and with leave to renew on the Circuit Court's Form 4 annexed to this Order. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 9/16/2025. (LOG) (Entered: 09/16/2025)
09/16/2025		ORDER: Plaintiff Orrego has now filed multiple applications seeking leave to file additional motions and/or open new cases. Though the cover letters for these motions comply with the Court's admonition that leave be sought in a short letter with a word limit, the motions attach hundreds, if not thousands of pages of material, which not only violate the filing injunction, but are unnecessarily duplicative material. The Clerk's Office is directed to return all of this material via first-class mail to Plaintiff. The motions seeking leave, in this case at Dkt. No. <u>106</u> , are denied. Plaintiff is prohibited from making any further filings on this docket, or using the portal available to pro se litigants, absent further order of this Court (no leave may be sought). The Clerk's Office is directed to terminate Plaintiff Orrego's access to the pro se portal, to reject and promptly return to Plaintiff any motion or document submitted by her, and not to file any submission on ECF or retain custody of such material. Plaintiff is reminded that her filing of this unnecessary material has simply impeded, delayed, and obstructed the Court's ability to resolve the merits of the case, and its ability to move this case forward, to trial (if appropriate). The Court will lift this filing injunction following resolution of the pending motions in all of her cases, in order to give her an opportunity to object, appeal, or reconsider any decision, or to make any post-decision filings attendant to trial, should the Court determine that the case should proceed to trial or further discovery. But until the Court renders such decisions, the filing injunction imposed by this order will remain in place. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 9/16/2025. (LOG) (Entered: 09/16/2025)
09/18/2025	<u>110</u>	Letter from Pro Se Department to Lidia M. Orrego dated 9/18/2025. The enclosed documents are being returned without docketing or consideration for the following reason(s): Pursuant to the enclosed electronic orders So Ordered by District Judge Bulsara on 9/16/2025 "The Clerk's Office is directed to return all of this material via first-class mail to Plaintiff." (NF) (Entered: 09/18/2025)
09/19/2025	<u>111</u>	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/23/2025)
09/23/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>107</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (KS) (Entered: 09/23/2025)

09/30/2025	<u>112</u>	Letter MOTION for Leave to Appeal <i>order of the court entered on September 16, 2025</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
09/30/2025	<u>113</u>	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
09/30/2025	<u>114</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion for Leave to File, entered on 9/16/2025, by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
10/01/2025		ORDER: Pro se Plaintiff Orrego's motion for leave to appeal <i>in forma pauperis</i> <u>111</u> is denied. "An appeal may not be taken <i>in forma pauperis</i> if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." <i>Romero v. DHL Express, Inc.</i>, No. 15-CV-4844, 2017 WL 2266990, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 6, 2017) (internal quotations and citations omitted). The "good faith" standard is objective; and it is not met when a party seeks review of a frivolous claim. <i>See Coppedge v. United States</i>, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Here Orrego seeks to appeal this Court's entry of a filing injunction. As this Court has repeatedly explained, the filing injunction--imposed after notice was provided--was an appropriate sanction given Orrego's repetitive filing of unnecessary material that has impeded, delayed, and obstructed the Court's ability to resolve the merits of the case. (See Order dated Aug. 14, 2025). The Court is prepared to lift the injunction following resolution of the pending motions in all of Plaintiff's cases. (See Order dated Sep. 16, 2025). A frivolous appeal of the injunction only works to further delay the resolution of these cases. The Court has reviewed the record and certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith. <i>See Coppedge</i>, 369 U.S. at 444-45. The application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> is denied. Pursuant to Rule 24(a)(4) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, the Clerk of Court shall immediately notify the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit of this order. The Clerk of Court is also respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to Orrego at her address of record and to record such service on the docket. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 10/1/2025. (LOG) Modified on 10/2/2025 (EM). (Entered: 10/01/2025)