APPEAL,PROSENEF

U.S. District Court
Eastern District of New York (Central Islip)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS

Orrego v. Knipfing et al
Assigned to: Judge Sanket J. Bulsara
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields
related Cases: 2:26-mc-01957-SJB
2:25-cv-00769-SJB-AYS
2:25-cv-00736-SJB-AYS
2:24-cv-07247-SJB-AYS
2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS
Cause: 42:2000e Job Discrimination (Employment)

Date Filed: 07/23/2020
Date Terminated: 05/08/2026
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 442 Civil Rights: Jobs
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
07/23/2020	1	COMPLAINT against All Defendants Was the Disclosure Statement on Civil Cover Sheet completed -No,, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Cover Letter, # 2 Service Instructions, # 3 Civil Cover Sheet) (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/23/2020	2	MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/23/2020	3	MOTION to Appoint Counsel by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Certificate of Service, # 2 Certificate of Service) (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/23/2020	4	Pro Se Consent to Electronic Notification by Lidia M. Orrego (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/27/2020		FILING FEE: $ 400.00, receipt number 29946 (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/27/2020	5	Summons Issued as to All Defendants. (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
07/31/2020	6	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.** (Cox, Dwayne) (Entered: 07/31/2020)
08/05/2020	7	Letter to pro se litigant Lidia Orrego from the Pro Se Office acknowledging receipt of civil action. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 08/05/2020)
08/17/2020	8	AMENDED COMPLAINT against Stepanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Main Document 8 replaced on 8/21/2020 to include missing pages referenced in DE 9 Letter) (Tirado, Chelsea). Modified on 8/21/2020 (Tirado, Chelsea). (Entered: 08/19/2020)

08/20/2020	9	Letter to the Court from pro se plaintiff Lidia Orrego re: Requesting assistance in correcting 8 Amended Complaint. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 08/20/2020)
09/14/2020	10	NOTICE of Appearance by Alexander B. Spiro on behalf of Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua (aty to be noticed) (Spiro, Alexander) (Entered: 09/14/2020)
09/14/2020	11	NOTICE of Appearance by Maaren Shah on behalf of Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua (aty to be noticed) (Shah, Maaren) (Entered: 09/14/2020)
09/14/2020	12	AFFIDAVIT of Service for Individual Practice Rules of Judge Gary R. Brown / *served by hand and electronic mail* / served on Lidia M. Orrego on September 12, 2020, filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua. (Shah, Maaren) (Entered: 09/14/2020)
09/14/2020	13	SUMMONS Returned Executed by Lidia M. Orrego. Stephanieanna James-Knipfing served on 8/24/2020, answer due 9/14/2020; Kevin Knipfing served on 8/24/2020, answer due 9/14/2020; Old Westbury EDDIE LLC served on 8/24/2020, answer due 9/14/2020; Old Westbury LLC served on 8/27/2020, answer due 9/17/2020; Steve Savitsky served on 8/26/2020, answer due 9/16/2020; Teresa A. Zantua served on 8/24/2020, answer due 9/14/2020. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 09/14/2020)
09/14/2020	14	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference *regarding Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Complaint 8* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua. (Shah, Maaren) (Entered: 09/14/2020)
09/15/2020		ORDER granting 14 Motion for Pre Motion Conference. A pre-motion telephone conference is scheduled for October 9, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. before Judge Gary R. Brown, at which time the parties should be prepared to address defendants' anticipated motion pursuant to Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, DE 14. **Counsel are to call (888) 363-4734 using ACCESS CODE 4132441 five minutes prior to the designated time.** The parties are on notice that in appropriate cases, the pre-motion letter and the response, along with counsels' arguments made at the pre-motion conference, may be construed at the discretion of the Court as the motion itself. Arguments not raised in the pre-motion letters or during the pre-motion conference shall be deemed waived. *See In re Best Payphones, Inc*., 450 F. App'x 8, 15 (2d Cir. 2011). At the conference, the Court will issue a briefing schedule if necessary. Plaintiff is directed to respond to DE 14 in accordance with the undersigned's individual rules by September 30, 2020. Before requesting an adjournment, the parties shall meet and confer and submit a joint letter with several proposed dates. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/15/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/15/2020)
09/18/2020	15	Letter MOTION to Appoint Counsel *and provide an Interpreter for October 9th conference* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 09/21/2020)
09/22/2020		ORDER finding as moot 2 Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis in light of pro se plaintiff's payment of the filing fee. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/22/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/22/2020)
09/22/2020		SCHEDULING ORDER: the pre-motion conference scheduled for October 9, 2020 is hereby ADJOURNED without date. The Court waives its pre-motion conference requirement, and establishes the following briefing schedule: defendants are directed to serve plaintiff with their motion on or before October 22, 2020; plaintiff is directed to serve defendants with her opposition to the motion on or before November 23, 2020; and defendants are directed to serve plaintiff with any reply memorandum and to file the fully briefed motion on or before December

		11, 2020. The parties are reminded to consult the undersigned's individual rules regarding motions, including bundling and page limits for Memoranda of Law, before filing their respective briefs. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/22/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/22/2020)
09/22/2020		ORDER denying 15 Motion to Appoint Counsel. Before the Court is pro se plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego's ("plaintiff") renewed motion for the appointment of pro bono counsel to represent her in this case. DE 15. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), courts may appoint an attorney to represent someone who is unable to afford counsel. Courts possess broad discretion when determining whether appointment is appropriate, subject to the requirement that it be "guided by sound legal principle." *Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., Inc.*, 877 F.2d 170, 171-72 (2d Cir. 1989) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). The Second Circuit set forth the principle as follows: > [T]he district judge should first determine whether the indigents position seems likely to be of substance. If the claim meets this threshold requirement, the court should then consider the indigents ability to investigate the crucial facts, whether conflicting evidence implicating the need for cross-examination will be the major proof presented to the fact finder, the indigents ability to present the case, the complexity of the legal issues and any special reason in that case why appointment of counsel would be more likely to lead to a just determination. *Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 61-62 (2d Cir. 1986). The Second Circuit also held that these factors are not restrictive, and that "[e]ach case must be decided on its own facts." *Id.* at 61. A developed record assists the court in this regard. *See Brooks v. State of New York*, 1992 WL 320402, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 29, 1992) (denying, without prejudice, appointment of counsel based on failure to satisfy requisite showing of likely merit). Further, "the Second Circuit has interpreted [28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1)] to require that the plaintiff be unable to obtain counsel before appointment will even be considered." *Ahmad v. White Plains City School Dist.*, 2020 WL 3972274, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2020) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); *see also Justice v. Kuhnapfel*, 982 F. Supp. 2d 233, 235 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) ("A plaintiff requesting appointment of counsel must show that she is unable to obtain counsel before appointment will even be considered.") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Here, plaintiff has paid the filing fee and has not demonstrated her indigence. Apart from this, however, even presuming that the threshold requirement of *Hodge* is satisfied, the Court is unable, at this juncture, to conclude -- after considering the Hodge factors in the context of plaintiff's application and the complaint as well as the record as a whole -- that the appointment of counsel is warranted. Specifically, despite plaintiff's claim that she needs the assistance of counsel because she does not know the procedures and rules that apply in Federal Court as well as her claimed disabilities that make her unable to handle the stressful situations to carry the case alone (Docket Entry 3 at 2), the Court concludes that plaintiff is able at this stage of the litigation to prosecute her case and that there is no special reason to appoint counsel. Accordingly, plaintiff's application for appointment of pro bono counsel is denied without prejudice to plaintiff renewing the application, if circumstances warrant such an application, at a later stage in these proceedings. This denial also is without prejudice to plaintiff hiring her own counsel to represent her in this matter. Additionally, in light of this Court's order adjourning the pre-motion conference and waiving the pre-motion conference requirement, plaintiff's application for an interpreter to be present at the conference is denied as moot. Although plaintiff paid the filing fee, the Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that, should plaintiff seek leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, any appeal from this Order would be an

		improper interlocutory appeal not taken in good faith. Therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/22/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/22/2020)
09/29/2020	16	Letter from pro se plaintiff Lidia Orrego re Responding to Defendants' pre-motion conference letter dated 9/15/2020. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 09/29/2020)
09/30/2020	17	MOTION to Substitute Attorney by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 09/30/2020)
09/30/2020	18	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua re 17 MOTION to Substitute Attorney (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 09/30/2020)
10/19/2020		ORDER granting 17 Motion to Substitute Attorney. Attorney Maaren Shah and Alexander B. Spiro terminated. Ordered by Magistrate Judge A. Kathleen Tomlinson on 10/19/2020. (Ameri, Mana) (Entered: 10/19/2020)
10/19/2020	19	Letter MOTION to Compel *the Court to give permission to Order Service by Publication to the Defendants* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 10/21/2020)
10/19/2020	20	Letter from Lidia M. Orrego titled "Proof of Service" requesting confirmation from the Court on the deadline for defendants to respond to the Summons and Complaint. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 10/21/2020)
10/21/2020	21	NOTICE of Appearance by Alex Dumas on behalf of All Defendants (aty to be noticed) (Dumas, Alex) (Entered: 10/21/2020)
10/23/2020		ORDER re 19 Letter MOTION to Compel. Pro se plaintiff's letter motion, DE 19, is respectfully referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge in accordance with the undersigned's individual rules. *See* II.e. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 10/23/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 10/23/2020)
12/11/2020	22	Fully Briefed MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of Alex Dumas in Support of Motion to Dismiss, # 2 Exhibit A - Offer Letter, # 3 Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss, # 4 Certificate of Service of Motion to Dismiss, # 5 Memorandum in Opposition of Motion to Dismiss, # 6 Affidavit of Service of Opposition, # 7 Exhibit 34, # 8 Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss, # 9 Reply Certificate of Service) (Dumas, Alex) (Entered: 12/11/2020)
12/16/2020	23	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 12/18/2020)
12/22/2020		ORDER denying 23 Motion for Pre Motion Conference. In her letter, pro se plaintiff appears to request a proceeding akin to a trial, wherein the parties would have the opportunity to present evidence and examine witnesses. In light of the fact that this case is far from trial-ready and still in its early stages - as indicated, for example, by the recent filing of defendants' fully briefed motion to dismiss - plaintiff's request is accordingly DENIED. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 12/22/2020. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 12/22/2020)
09/08/2021	24	MOTION for Leave to File Document *Amended Complaint* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 09/08/2021)
09/13/2021	25	RESPONSE in Opposition re 24 MOTION for Leave to File Document *Amended Complaint* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old

		Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F, # 7 Exhibit G, # 8 Exhibit H, # 9 Exhibit I) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 09/13/2021)
09/17/2021	26	OBJECTION to 25 Opposition to 24 MOTION for Leave to File *Amended Complaint* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Coleman, Laurie) Modified on 9/20/2021 to revise docket text (Coleman, Laurie). (Entered: 09/20/2021)
09/20/2021	27	AMENDED OBJECTION to 25 Opposition to 24 MOTION for Leave to File *Amended Complaint* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Coleman, Laurie) (Entered: 09/20/2021)
09/21/2021	28	ORDER denying 19 Motion to Compel, without prejudice. SEE ATTACHED ORDER. Counsel for Defendants is directed to serve a copy of this Order on the Pro Se Plaintiff forthwith and to file proof of such service on ECF by September 24, 2021. Ordered by Magistrate Judge A. Kathleen Tomlinson on 9/21/2021. (Tomlinson, A.) (Entered: 09/21/2021)
09/23/2021	29	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua re 28 Order on Motion to Compel, (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 09/23/2021)
09/30/2021	30	ORDER granting in part and denying in part 22 Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim. For the reasons set forth in the attached Memorandum & Order, it is hereby Ordered that defendants' motion is GRANTED as to plaintiff's claims under the NYCHRL, the New York Labor Law, the New York Penal Law, and plaintiff's claims for discrimination under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 and the NYSHRL; additionally, defendants' motion is GRANTED as to plaintiff's retaliation claims against Savitsky and Zantua and plaintiff's hostile work environment claims against Savitsky. Otherwise, defendants' motion is DENIED. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/30/2021. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/30/2021)
09/30/2021		ORDER denying 24 Motion for Leave to File. The allegations which *pro se* plaintiff apparently seeks to add in a contemplated amended complaint appear to relate only to claims dismissed in this Court's earlier Order of September 30, 2021. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is DENIED as any such amendment would be futile. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 9/30/2021. (Meil, Stephen) (Entered: 09/30/2021)
10/04/2021	31	Letter by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/04/2021)
10/04/2021	32	NOTICE of Appearance by Edward E. Warnke on behalf of All Defendants (aty to be noticed) (Warnke, Edward) (Entered: 10/04/2021)
10/14/2021	33	ANSWER to 8 Amended Complaint, by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Warnke, Edward) (Entered: 10/14/2021)
10/26/2021		NOTICE: The Initial Conference scheduled for November 2, 2021 is adjourned without date pending reassignment of this action to another Magistrate Judge. Counsel for Defendants is directed to serve a copy of this Order on the Pro Se Plaintiff forthwith and to file proof of such service on ECF by October 28, 2021. (Ameri, Mana) (Entered: 10/26/2021)
10/26/2021	34	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/26/2021)
11/02/2021	35	MOTION to Withdraw 33 Answer to Amended Complaint *(pages 19 & 20)* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 11/02/2021)
11/05/2021	36	Letter *Opposition to PS Motion to Strike* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Warnke, Edward) (Entered:

		11/05/2021)
11/09/2021	37	Letter replying to 36 Defendants' Opposition to Motion to Withdraw by Lidia M Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 11/09/2021)
11/16/2021		ORDER denying 35 Motion to Withdraw Answer to Amended Complaint (pages 19 & 20). Affording plaintiff the special solicitude accorded to pro se litigants, the Court construes plaintiff's November 2, 2021 letter, DE 35, as a motion to strike the defenses asserted in defendants' answer to the Amended Complaint. Defendants' defenses include, *inter alia*, that the amended complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, that actions taken by defendants were for non-retaliatory reasons, and plaintiff is pursuing this matter in bad faith for vexatious reasons, citing a number of other suits filed by plaintiff that have been dismissed. DE 33 at 19-20. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f), "[t]he court may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter." "Accordingly, [t]he standard to prevail on a motion to strike is demanding, requiring that the moving party demonstrate that (1) there may be no question of fact which might allow the defense to succeed; (2) there may be no substantial question of law, a resolution of which could allow the defense to succeed; and (3) the party would be prejudiced by the inclusion of the defense." *Grewal v. Cuneo*, No. 13-CV-6836(RA), 2016 WL 308803, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 25, 2016) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). Plaintiff argues that defendants improperly referred to her other lawsuits because they remain pending, and the documentary evidence will ultimately prove her case. While these arguments may go to the merits of her claim, plaintiff has failed to establish that she is prejudiced by the inclusion of the asserted defenses or that there is no question of fact which might allow these defenses to succeed. Thus, plaintiff's motion to strike the defenses asserted in defendants' answer to the amended complaint is DENIED. The Court has reconsidered its decision regarding appointment of counsel. While plaintiff is not entitled to counsel as of right, the Pro Se Department is respectfully directed to find counsel for plaintiff from this Court's pro bono panel. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 11/16/2021. c/ecf (Tahbaz, Joseph) (Entered: 11/16/2021)
11/22/2021	38	ORDER - Accordingly, the Court appoints The Dratch Law Firm, PC, by Brian M Dratch, Esq., to represent Plaintiff. Counsel shall file a Notice of Appearance and contact Plaintiff forthwith. The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff and to Mr. Dratch. SO Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 11/22/2021. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 11/22/2021)
11/22/2021	39	Letter to Judge Brown from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego submitting "Clarification Letter". (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 11/23/2021)
11/23/2021		Case randomly reassigned to Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields. Magistrate Judge A. Kathleen Tomlinson 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. (Florio, Lisa) (Entered: 11/23/2021)
11/30/2021	40	NOTICE of Appearance by Brian Michael Dratch on behalf of Lidia M. Orrego (aty to be noticed) (Dratch, Brian) (Entered: 11/30/2021)
12/02/2021	41	ORDER: Initial Conference set for 2/14/2022 at 11:30 AM before Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields.The parties are directed to call the ATTteleconferencing center at (877) 810-9415 and to enter Access Code 9005911 when prompted. See order and attachments. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 12/2/2021. (Attachments: # 1 AYS Rules, # 2 Joint Letter Requirements, # 3 Employment Protocols) (Torres, Jasmine) (Entered: 12/02/2021)

02/10/2022	42	CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT *for Employment Cases with Discovery Plan Worksheet* (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order) (Warnke, Edward) (Entered: 02/10/2022)
02/11/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: In light of the filing of the initial letter, the initial conference scheduled for February 14, 2022 is **CANCELED**. Counsel are directed to complete the Employment Protocols found in the undersigned's Individual Rules by the April 12, 2022 date described in the joint letter and on April 13, 2022, submit a joint status letter stating with particularity, the precise discovery necessary and dates for completion thereof, for this matter to be trial or dispositive motion practice ready. A telephone status conference has been scheduled for April 19, 2022 at 12:00 PM. Counsel are directed to call the AT&T Teleconference Center at (877) 810-9415 at the time of the conference and enter Access Code 9005911 when prompted. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 2/11/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 02/11/2022)
02/14/2022	43	Letter MOTION to Substitute Attorney , *new bilingual counsel/attorney* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 02/15/2022)
02/17/2022	45	AFFIDAVIT/DECLARATION in Support re 43 Letter MOTION to Substitute Attorney , *new bilingual counsel/attorney* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 02/24/2022)
02/18/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: A telephone conference regarding Plaintiff's motion to substitute counsel has been scheduled for March 8, 2022 at 1:30 PM. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel are directed to call the AT&T Teleconference Center at (877) 810-9415 at the time of the conference and enter Access Code 9005911 when prompted. Plaintiff's counsel is directed to serve a copy of this order on Plaintiff and provide proof of service on ECF by February 22, 2022. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 2/18/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 02/18/2022)
02/22/2022	44	AFFIDAVIT of Service for Copy of Order *scheduling telephone conference on 03/08/2022* served on Lidia Orrego on 02/18/2022, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Dratch, Brian) (Entered: 02/22/2022)
02/22/2022	46	Letter to Judge Shields from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego regarding 3/8/2022 Telephone Conference (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 02/24/2022)
03/08/2022		ORDER granting in part and denying in part 43 Motion to Substitute Attorney. As set forth on the record during the conference held on March 8, 2022, Plaintiff's motion for substitution of counsel is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Plaintiff's appointed counsel, Mr. Dratch, is relieved as Plaintiff's counsel and the Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate his appearance on the docket herein. However, Plaintiff's request to have new bilingual counsel appointed is denied without prejudice to renewal to the District Judge. To be clear, if Plaintiff wishes to request new counsel be appointed, she must make a new pro bono counsel motion to the Honorable Gary R. Brown. The Court further orders that this matter be stayed for a period of 60 days for Plaintiff to either: (1) request appointment of new pro bono counsel; or (2) obtain new counsel; or (3) for Plaintiff to decide to proceed pro se. Plaintiff is directed to communicate with this Court via letter on or before May 9, 2022 stating how Plaintiff will proceed in this matter. Plaintiff is advised that failure to communicate with this Court may result in this Court's recommendation to the District Court that the case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Further, the Court encourages all pro se litigants to consult with the Hofstra Law Pro Se Clinic located in the Central Islip Courthouse, which can provide free information, advice, and limited scope legal assistance to non-incarcerated pro se litigants. The Court notes that the Pro Se Clinic is not part of, nor affiliated with, the United States District Court. The Clinic offers services such as: providing brief legal counseling; advising you about potential federal claims prior to filing suit; explaining federal court rules and procedures; and reviewing and editing draft pleadings and correspondence with the Court. Additionally, the Clinic may aid you during the discovery process, and, in appropriate circumstances, may represent you at deposition or in the settlement process. Consultations with the Pro Se Clinic can be conducted remotely via telephone. If you wish to contact the Pro Se

		Clinic to make an appointment, email them at PSLAP@Hofstra.edu or leave a message at (631) 297-2575. Plaintiff's outgoing counsel is directed to serve a copy of this Order on Plaintiff and provide proof of service on ECF by March 10, 2022. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/8/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 03/08/2022)
03/08/2022		Attorney Brian Michael Dratch terminated. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/8/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 03/08/2022)
03/08/2022	49	Minute Entry for proceedings held before Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields:Motion Hearing held on 3/8/2022 re 43 Letter MOTION to Substitute Attorney , *new bilingual counsel/attorney* filed by Lidia M. Orrego (FTR Log #1:33-1:38.) (Torres, Jasmine) (Entered: 03/15/2022)
03/09/2022	47	AFFIDAVIT/AFFIRMATION re Order on Motion to Substitute Attorney,,,,,,,,, *of service* by Lidia M. Orrego (Dratch, Brian) (Entered: 03/09/2022)
03/10/2022	48	Letter to Judge Shields from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego in response to 3/8/2022 Electronic Order. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 03/10/2022)
03/14/2022		ORDER re 48 Plaintiff's Letter for Reconsideration. Plaintiff's request for reconsideration of this Court's Order denying Plaintiff's application for new bilingual pro bono counsel to be appointed is DENIED. As stated during the conference and in the Order, if Plaintiff wishes to request new counsel be appointed, she must make a new pro bono counsel motion to the Honorable Gary R. Brown on or before May 9, 2022. Any new pro bono application will not be deemed to be made in bad faith as the Court has instructed Plaintiff to make such a request. Plaintiff is reminded that by May 9, 2022, Plaintiff must communicate to the Court, by letter, that she either: (1) requests appointment of new pro bono counsel; or (2) has obtained new counsel; or (3) has decided to proceed pro se. Plaintiff is advised that failure to communicate with this Court may result in this Court's recommendation to the District Court that the case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/14/2022. c/m pltf 3/14/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 03/14/2022)
03/17/2022	50	Letter to Judge Shields from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego in response to 3/14/2022 Order. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 03/17/2022)
04/14/2022	51	Letter to Judge Shields from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego informing the Court of proceeding pro se, requesting to remove 42 from the docket, and requesting an interpreter for future conferences. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 04/18/2022)
04/19/2022	52	SCHEDULING ORDER: The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff's notification found in docket entry No. 51 . That notification advises the Court that Plaintiff wishes to proceed pro se, and that she is currently seeking the limited representation assistance provided by the Hofstra University School of Law legal assistance program. With respect to Plaintiff's request to remove docket entry No. 42 from the docket, the Court notes that it cannot remove items from the public docket. See Gambale v. Deutsche Bank AG, 377 F.3d 133, 144 (2d Cir. 2004) (noting that once "the genie is out of the bottle," courts "have not the means to put the genie back."). However, the Court interprets Plaintiff's request as a request to vacate its initial conference order found at docket entry No. 41 , effectively rendering docket entry No. 42 moot. In accord with that interpretation, the Court therefore will vacate that initial conference order. The request for a Spanish interpreter in this civil case has been made, and it is once again, denied. The Court does not provide interpreters for civil cases. Plaintiff is certainly free to retain her own interpreter, at her own expense, for any future conferences. She may also raise this issue with the Hofstra clinic. While they are not required to provide interpreting services, they may be able to assist Plaintiff. See attached Order for additional details as well as for the Tier I Discovery Schedule. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 4/19/2022. c/m pltf on 4/19/2022 (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 04/19/2022)

04/22/2022	53	Letter to Judge Brown from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego informing the Court of name change, but deciding to proceed as Lidia M. Orrego. (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 04/26/2022)
04/26/2022	54	Letter to Judge Shields from pro se plaintiff Lidia M Orrego re 52 Orders (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 04/26/2022)
04/27/2022	55	Mail receipt to Lidia M Orrego - Date of Delivery: 4/22/2022 (Tirado, Chelsea) (Entered: 04/28/2022)
05/02/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: In light of Plaintiff's letter dated April 22, 2022 and found at docket entry No. 54 , this Court **VACATES** its April 19, 2022 Order, found at docket entry No. 52 . To be clear, the Tier I Discovery schedule set forth in the April 19, 2022 order is **VACATED**. An in-person initial conference has been scheduled for July 5, 2022 in courtroom 840 of the Central Islip courthouse. All discovery in this case is STAYED pending the in-person July 5, 2022 conference. A new discovery schedule will be issued at the in-person conference. If Plaintiff wishes, she may bring a personal interpreter to the in-person conference. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 5/2/2022. c/m pltf 5/2/2022 (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 05/02/2022)
05/02/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: The July 5, 2022 in-person initial conference is scheduled for 10:30 AM in courtroom 840 of the Central Islip courthouse. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 5/2/2022. c/m pltf on 5/2/2022 (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 05/02/2022)
07/05/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: As set forth on the record during the conference held today, the Court clarifies that a hostile work environment claim remains against Mr. Knipfing. Further, Plaintiff has agreed that all service in this matter may proceed via email. The following Phase I discovery schedule was entered: By August 1, 2022, the parties shall exchange all documents/recordings/video relating to Plaintiff's employment. The production shall include, but is not limited to, the non-disclosure agreement executed by Plaintiff, all documents referenced in Plaintiff's amended complaint such as the relevant portions of her diary, as well as Plaintiffs November complaint to Mr. Knipfing, and any emails and text messages, as well as any other documents relating to Plaintiff's employment. To be clear, these documents are to be exchanged by all parties regardless of how that party came into possession of the document. On August 15, 2022, the parties are directed to submit one joint status letter setting forth whether this paper discovery has been completed. Defendants shall file the joint status letter. Upon receipt of the August 15, 2022 joint status letter the Court will enter an order as to the remainder of discovery so that this case can proceed. If the parties need additional time, they are directed to communicate with each other via email, and after reaching an agreement, submit a letter notifying this Court as to their agreement. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/5/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 07/05/2022)
07/05/2022	56	Minute Entry for proceedings held before Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields:Initial Conference Hearing held on 7/5/2022 (FTR Log #10:50-11:23.) (Torres, Jasmine) (Entered: 07/06/2022)
07/08/2022	57	NOTICE of Motion of Default Judgment by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum in Support, # 2 Affidavit in Support) (Cubano, Jazmin) (Entered: 07/08/2022)
07/11/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: As Plaintiff has filed a motion for default against the Defendants, in order to ensure efficient, speedy and just motion practice, the following briefing schedule is now in effect: Defendants' opposition must be served and filed on or before August 11, 2022. Plaintiff's reply to the opposition shall be served and filed on or before August 25, 2022. Plaintiff is NOT to serve and file a reply until after receiving Defendants' opposition. The Discovery Schedule issued during the July 5, 2022 conference REMAINS IN EFFECT. So

		Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/11/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 07/11/2022)
07/26/2022	58	First MOTION for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery *(To Serve Defendants' Initial Document Production)* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 07/26/2022)
07/27/2022	59	RESPONSE in Opposition re 58 First MOTION for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery *(To Serve Defendants' Initial Document Production)* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Cubano, Jazmin) (Entered: 07/27/2022)
07/28/2022		ORDER denying 58 Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery. Defendants' request for a two week extension of time for the current discovery deadlines and briefing schedule is DENIED. The discovery deadlines were set during the in-person conference held on July 5, 2022. At that conference the parties were asked whether they objected to the deadlines or would have any problems meeting the proposed deadlines. Defense counsel did not object nor did he indicate meeting the deadlines would be problematic. As such, Defendants' request for the extension lacks the requisite good cause needed for such an adjournment. Schedules and deadlines of other cases do not warrant an extension of time in this case, especially when the instant deadlines were not imposed without first seeking to accommodate counsel and Plaintiff's schedules. Accordingly, the extension request is denied. All previously ordered deadlines remain in effect. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/28/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 07/28/2022)
08/11/2022	60	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re 57 Notice (Other) filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/11/2022)
08/11/2022	61	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re 57 Notice (Other) filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration, # 2 Exhibit A) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/11/2022)
08/12/2022	65	Letter MOTION to Compel *Challenging the Confidentiality of Documents of the Defendants Initial Discovery dated August 1, 2022,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Ortiz, Grisel) (Entered: 08/18/2022)
08/15/2022	62	Letter *to Judge Regarding Joint Status* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/15/2022)
08/16/2022		SCHEDULING ORDER: In view of the completion of the voluntary exchange of the Court ordered category of documents the parties are directed to move forward with depositions. All depositions must be completed by February 28, 2023. Plaintiff shall be deposed first. Plaintiff and defense counsel are directed to confer regarding the number of depositions and the timing of the depositions. The parties may to agree to conduct the depositions either in-person or remotely. Upon the conclusion of the depositions, the parties may agree to seek additional documentary discovery. A joint status letter shall be filed on March 2, 2023. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 8/16/2022. (Mucciaccio, Dina) (Entered: 08/16/2022)
08/17/2022	63	Preliminary Statement: Reply Memoranda of Law in Support Plaintiff's Motion Default Judgment, filed by Pro Se Litigant Lidia M. Orrego dated 8/17/2022. (Ortiz, Grisel) Modified on 10/11/2022- pro se contacted the clerks office, added the additional language description to the document. (GO). (Entered: 08/17/2022)
08/17/2022	64	Letter from Pro Se Litigant to Judge Shields dated 8/17/2022 Re: 8/16/2022 Scheduling Order. (Ortiz, Grisel) (Entered: 08/17/2022)
08/22/2022	66	RESPONSE to Motion re 65 Letter MOTION to Compel *Challenging the Confidentiality of Documents of the Defendants Initial Discovery dated August 1, 2022,* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A.

		Zantua. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit A (Track-changed revisions to form Stipulation and Order of Confidentiality), # 2 Exhibit B (Clean version of Exhibit A)) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/22/2022)
08/24/2022	67	REPLY to Response to Motion re 65 Letter MOTION to Compel *Challenging the Confidentiality of Documents of the Defendants Initial Discovery dated August 1, 2022,* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Cubano, Jazmin) (Entered: 08/25/2022)
10/03/2022		ORDER : All pretrial proceedings, including DE 65, are hereby referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge. In addition, any dispositive pretrial motions are referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge for a Report and Recommendation. In accordance with Rule 73 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 73.1, the parties are reminded that, if all parties consent, a United States Magistrate Judge may: (1) conduct all proceedings in this civil action (including a jury or nonjury trial) and to order the entry of a final judgment; or (2) conduct all proceedings and enter a final order on a particular motion. A consent form should be signed and filed electronically only if all parties wish to consent and it is signed by all parties. Consent forms may be accessed at the following links: http://www.uscourts.gov/uscourts/FormsAndFees/Forms/AO085.pdf http://www.uscourts.gov/uscourts/FormsAndFees/Forms/AO085A.pdf. You may withhold your consent without adverse substantive consequences. DO NOT return or file a consent form unless all parties have signed the consent. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 10/3/2022. c/ecf (LJ) (Entered: 10/03/2022)
10/11/2022	68	LETTER dated 10/10/2022 from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Brown re Request that the Court grant the motion ECF doc. 57 & 63 duly supported by a statement of facts, laws, and documentary evidence, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 26 & 37. (LC) (Entered: 10/17/2022)
11/21/2022	69	Letter MOTION for Sanctions by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Documents in Support, # 2 Affirmation of Service) (JC) (Entered: 11/23/2022)
02/10/2023	70	Letter MOTION for Preliminary Injunction by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 02/10/2023)
02/10/2023	71	RESPONSE to Motion re 70 Letter MOTION for Preliminary Injunction filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 02/10/2023)
02/13/2023	72	Affirmation in REPLY to Defendants Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion re 70 Letter MOTION for Preliminary Injunction filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 02/13/2023)
02/13/2023	73	Notice of MOTION for Declaratory Judgment *with affirmation and exhibits attached* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 02/13/2023)
02/13/2023	74	Amended MOTION to Compel *for Injuncive Relief, Rulings on DE's 69 and 57 , and reschedule discovery process* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 02/13/2023)
02/13/2023	75	Letter from Lidia Orrego to Judge Brown dtd 1/13/2023 requesting EMERGENCY Conference with digital audio recording for rulings regarding motions, and Motion for Declaratory Relief. (JC) (Entered: 02/13/2023)
02/22/2023	76	NOTICE of Appearance by Jennifer A Gundlach on behalf of Lidia M. Orrego (aty to be noticed) (Gundlach, Jennifer) (Entered: 02/22/2023)
02/24/2023		ORDER. Plaintiff is reminded that the undersigned's individual rules prohibit parties from sending ex parte email communications - or email communications of any kind - to the Court's

		email without the Court's prior permission. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 2/24/2023. (DM) (Entered: 02/24/2023)
02/27/2023	77	Letter MOTION to Change Venue *Request that the court grant the change to the District and Magistrate Judge and the Venue to Brooklyn Courthouse,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 02/27/2023)
02/28/2023	78	RESPONSE in Opposition re 77 Letter MOTION to Change Venue *Request that the court grant the change to the District and Magistrate Judge and the Venue to Brooklyn Courthouse,* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 02/28/2023)
02/28/2023	79	MOTION to Withdraw as Attorney *by Limited Scope Pro Bono Counsel* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Gundlach, Jennifer) (Entered: 02/28/2023)
03/01/2023	80	Letter MOTION to Compel *to report new misconduct and fraudulent concealment or misrepresentation from Mr. Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh, Defendants' counsel,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/01/2023)
03/02/2023	81	Letter *Status Letter to the Court* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit A-Email) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 03/02/2023)
03/02/2023	82	Objection letter to 81 Status Letter to the Court filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF) (Main Document 82 replaced on 3/6/2023) (LF). (Entered: 03/03/2023)
03/03/2023	83	Letter from Lidia M. Orrego to Magistrate Judge Shields to report the status of Deposition and other discovery to develop after receiving the ruling on Motion Default Judgment ECF 57 . (LF) (Main Document 83 replaced on 3/6/2023) (LF). (Entered: 03/03/2023)
03/06/2023	84	Letter to Judge Shields from Lidia M. Orrego dtd 3/3/2023 in accordance with 8/16/2022 Scheduling Order to file this letter in connection to Defendant's Depositions. (JC) (Entered: 03/06/2023)
03/06/2023	85	REPLY to Response to Motion re 77 , 78 Letter MOTION to Change Venue *Request that the court grant the change to the District and Magistrate Judge and the Venue to Brooklyn Courthouse,* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/07/2023)
03/06/2023	86	RESPONSE to Motion re 80 Letter MOTION to Compel *to report new misconduct and fraudulent concealment or misrepresentation from Mr. Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh, Defendants' counsel,* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/07/2023)
03/09/2023		SCHEDULING ORDER: Defense counsel is directed to provide a complete copy of Plaintiff's February 27, 2023 deposition transcript for the Court's review. **The transcript must be emailed to shields_chambers@nyed.uscourts.gov by 5:00 PM on Friday, March 10, 2023**. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/9/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/09/2023)
03/09/2023	87	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS re 73 Notice of MOTION for Declaratory Judgment *with affirmation and exhibits attached* filed by Lidia M. Orrego, 77 Letter MOTION to Change Venue *Request that the court grant the change to the District and Magistrate Judge and the Venue to Brooklyn Courthouse,* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. For the reasons set forth in the Order and Report and Recommendation, it is respectfully recommended that Plaintiff's motions for a declaratory judgment in her favor, and the motion to change venue to the Brooklyn Courthouse, be denied. A copy of this Order and Report and Recommendation is being provided to all counsel and Plaintiff via ECF. Any written objections to this Report and Recommendation portion must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days of filing of this report. Entered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/9/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/09/2023)
03/10/2023	88	ORDER denying 65 Motion to Compel; denying 69 Motion for Sanctions; denying 70 Motion for Preliminary Injunction; denying 74 Motion to Compel; denying 79 Motion to Withdraw as Attorney; denying 80 Motion to Compel. For the reasons set forth in the attached Order, Plaintiff's motions appearing at docket entries 57 , 65 , 69 , 70 , 74 and 80 are denied. The

		proposed confidentiality order appearing as docket entry No. [66-1] is So Ordered. Defendants' motion for additional time in which to depose Plaintiff, appearing as docket entry No. 81 , is denied without prejudice to renew upon providing the Court with the transcript of Plaintiff's deposition. Finally, Limited Scope Counsel's motion appearing as docket entry No. 79 is denied without prejudice to renew in accord with this Order. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/9/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/10/2023)
03/10/2023	89	Letter from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Shields dtd 3/10/2023 Plaintiff's depositions served on March 10, 2023 - Lack of review or approval. (JC) (Entered: 03/13/2023)
03/13/2023		SCHEDULING ORDER: Based upon Counsel's request, the Court's review of the transcript and the reference of the Court reporter to the time of testimony, the Court directs Plaintiff to appear for an additional 2 hours of deposition testimony. The deposition must be completed by April 7, 2023. Limited scope counsel is granted one week in which to determine whether to renew its request to be relieved from representation. In the event that no motion is made the Court will assume that limited scope counsel will represent Plaintiff at her continued deposition. In any event there will be no extension of the April 7, 2023 deadline. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/13/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/13/2023)
03/14/2023	90	Letter MOTION to Compel *to terminate or limit plaintiff's depositions/modify 3/13/2023 Scheduling Order* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/14/2023)
03/14/2023	91	Letter from Lidia M. Orrego dtd 3/14/23 requesting clarification regarding communication between the Court and the Defendants. (JC) (Entered: 03/14/2023)
03/15/2023	92	ORDER granting in part and denying in part 90 Motion to Compel. To the extent that Plaintiff's motion is one for reconsideration of this Court's prior ruling directing Plaintiff to appear for an additional 2 hours of deposition testimony, the motion for reconsideration is GRANTED. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks to modify the existing order directing her to appear for an additional 2 hours of deposition testimony, the motion is DENIED. Upon reconsideration, the Court adheres to its original ruling and directs Plaintiff to appear for an additional 2 hours of deposition testimony to be completed by April 7, 2023. For reference, attached is a copy of Plaintiff's February 27, 2023 deposition transcript as well as a copy of an email from the deposition court reporter to Plaintiff confirming the length of the February 27, 2023 deposition. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/15/2023. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit) (DM) (Entered: 03/15/2023)
03/15/2023	93	Notice of MOTION to Withdraw as Attorney *Renewed* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Gundlach, Jennifer) (Entered: 03/15/2023)
03/15/2023	94	Letter MOTION to Vacate 88 Order on Motion to Compel,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,, Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Withdraw as Attorney,,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/17/2023)
03/16/2023		ORDER granting 93 Motion to Withdraw as Attorney. The request by Plaintiff's Limited Scope Counsel to withdraw is GRANTED. Attorney Jennifer A Gundlach terminated. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/16/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/16/2023)
03/17/2023	95	Letter Motion to Vacate from Lidia Orrego to Judge Shields dtd 3/16/2023 re: Letter Motion to Vacate Order DE 88 on "Letter Motion Challenging the Confidentiality DE (65] unrelated to the Unconscionable "Confidentiality Agreement" [66-1]. (JC) Modified on 3/21/2023 (JT). (Entered: 03/17/2023)
03/20/2023	98	Letter MOTION to Vacate 88 Order on Motion to Compel,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,, Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Withdraw as Attorney,,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit) (GO) (Entered: 03/22/2023)
03/21/2023		ORDER denying 95 Motion to Vacate 95 MOTION to Vacate. Plaintiff's request that this Court vacate the order found at docket entry No. 88 is DENIED. To be clear, the Court adheres to its original ruling with regard to the documents designated as confidential and the Order of

		Confidentiality entered to govern discovery herein. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 3/21/2023. (DM) (Entered: 03/21/2023)
03/21/2023	96	Notice of MOTION to Vacate *the Challenged Order* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/22/2023)
03/22/2023	97	Letter Notice of Motion to Vacate the Challenged Order DE 88 . (JC) (Entered: 03/22/2023)
03/22/2023	99	MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply as to 73 Notice of MOTION for Declaratory Judgment *with affirmation and exhibits attached*, 77 Letter MOTION to Change Venue *Request that the court grant the change to the District and Magistrate Judge and the Venue to Brooklyn Courthouse,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/23/2023)
03/22/2023	100	Notice of MOTION to Vacate 88 Order on Motion to Compel,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,, Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Withdraw as Attorney,,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit) (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/23/2023	101	NOTICE ENTRY PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS/ OBJECTION to 87 Report and Recommendations, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/23/2023	102	Amended MOTION to Vacate 88 Order on Motion to Compel,,,, Order on Motion for Sanctions,,,, Order on Motion for Preliminary Injunction,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Withdraw as Attorney,,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/23/2023	103	Amended MOTION to Vacate 96 Notice of MOTION to Vacate *the Challenged Order /AMENDED ECF 96 NOTICE OF MOTION VACATE THE CHALLENGED ORDER,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/23/2023	104	Amended MOTION to Vacate 97 Letter */AMENDED ECF 97 NOTICE OF MOTION VACATE THE CHALLENGED ORDER DE 88 ,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/24/2023	105	SECOND NOTICE ENTRY PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS/ OBJECTION to 87 Report and Recommendations, filed by Lidia M. Orrego dated 3/24/2023. (GO) (Entered: 03/24/2023)
03/28/2023		ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS for 73 Motion for Declaratory Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego, 77 Motion to Change Venue filed by Lidia M. Orrego, adopting 87 Report and Recommendations. Presently before the Court is the Report and Recommendation dated March 9, 2023, DE 87, of United States Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields recommending that Plaintiff's motions for a declaratory judgment in her favor, and the motion to change venue to the Brooklyn Courthouse, be denied. In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, the district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party makes specific and timely objections to a Magistrate Judge's findings or recommendations as to dispositive motions, the district court must apply a de novo standard of review to the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which the objection is made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see LLC v. Doe 3*, 604 F.3d 110, 116 (2d Cir. 2010); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, "general or conclusory objections, or objections which merely recite the same arguments presented to the magistrate judge, are reviewed for clear error." *Caldarola v. Town of Smithtown*, No. 09-cv-272, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37280, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 4, 2011). On March 22, 2023, Plaintiff requested eight additional days to file her objections to the Report and Recommendation. DE 99. Whereas Plaintiff already filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on March 23 and March 24, 2023, *see* DEs 101, 105, the request for an extension of time is denied as moot. In her objections, Plaintiff argues that Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields "misapplied" the concept of the Plaintiff's motion for Declaratory Relief in order to protect the Defendant, *see* DE 101 at 5, and that transferring this case to Brooklyn would be a "win-win" because the Plaintiff will "try to seek justice in a forum that protects the

		working class" and "this Court will not have to deal with Plaintiff whom it has been rejecting after September 30, 2021," *see* DE 105 at 6. Although de novo review is not required, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report and Recommendation, and having reviewed the motion papers, the applicable law, and having conducted a careful review of the Report and Recommendation de novo, the Court has determined that Judge Shields correctly determined that the motion for declaratory judgment should be denied in light of this case's ongoing discovery and that this case was properly designated as a Long Island case. *See Orrego v. Knipfing*, 564 F. Supp. 3d 273, 278-82 (E.D.N.Y. 2021) (summarizing allegations of misconduct against defendants in Nassau County). As such, the objections to the Report and Recommendation are OVERRULED and the Report and Recommendation dated March 9, 2023, DE 87, of United States Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields is ADOPTED in its entirety. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 3/28/2023. (JT) (Entered: 03/28/2023)
03/28/2023		ORDER denying 99 Motion for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 3/28/2023. c/ecf (JT) (Entered: 03/28/2023)
03/28/2023		ORDER denying 94 Motion to Vacate, 96 Notice of MOTION to Vacate, 98 Letter MOTION to Vacate, 100 Notice of MOTION to Vacate, 102 Amended MOTION to Vacate, 103 Amended MOTION to Vacate, 104 Amended MOTION to Vacate. Presently before the Court are a series of objections to the Orders of Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields dated March 9, 2023, DE 88. *See* DEs 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104. Discovery orders by a magistrate judge are generally considered "nondispositive" of the litigation. *See Thomas E. Hoar, Inc. v. Sara Lee Corp.*, 900 F.2d 522, 525 (2d Cir. 1990). Accordingly, a district court must affirm such orders unless they are "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). This standard of review is "highly deferential," *see Thai Lao Lignite (Thai.) Co. v. Gov't of Lao People's Dem. Rep.*, 924 F. Supp. 2d 508, 511-12 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted), and "magistrates are afforded broad discretion in resolving discovery disputes," *see MASTR Adjustable Rate Mortgs. Tr. 2006-OA2 v. UBS Real Estate Secs. Inc.*, No. 12 Civ. 7322, 2013 WL 6840282, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 27, 2013) (citation omitted). In a series of repetitive and verbose objections, Plaintiff principally argues that Judge Shields lacked the authority to issue the Orders in DE 88 and calls into question Judge Shields' impartiality. Whereas all of the Orders issued by Judge Shields concerned discovery matters and the allegations of bias are unsubstantiated, Plaintiff's objections are OVERRULED. 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. The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 3/28/2023. (JT) (Entered: 03/28/2023)
03/31/2023	106	Letter MOTION to Compel *defendants counsel to provide plaintiff with copies of numerous things* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 03/31/2023)
04/04/2023	107	Letter *In Response to Plaintiff's March 31, 2023 Letter Motion to Compel* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 04/04/2023)

04/04/2023	108	Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego's request for Judicial Notice Adjudicative of Facts, filed concurrently with Notice of Motion to take Judicial Notice Adjudicative of Facts and instruction to the Jury to accept the noticed fact as conclusive, granting relief to Plaintiff of the burden of proof in the Trial pursuant Fed. Rules of Evidence 201 (JC) (Entered: 04/05/2023)
04/06/2023	109	MOTION to Vacate *03/28/2023 ORDER denying 94 Motion to Vacate, 96 Notice of MOTION to Vacate, 98 Letter MOTION to Vacate, 100 Notice of MOTION to Vacate, 102 Amended MOTION to Vacate, 103 Amended MOTION to Vacate, 104 Amended MOTION to Vacate* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 04/06/2023)
04/10/2023		ORDER REFERRING MOTION: 106 Letter MOTION to Compel *defendants counsel to provide plaintiff with copies of numerous things* filed by Lidia M. Orrego. Plaintiff's motion (DE 106) is respectfully referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all appropriate action, if any. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 4/10/2023. Motions referred to Anne Y. Shields. (MR) (Entered: 04/10/2023)
04/10/2023		ORDER. Plaintiff's motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201 (DE 108) is denied without prejudice to renewal at the time of trial. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 4/10/2023. (MR) (Entered: 04/10/2023)
04/10/2023		ORDER denying 109 Motion to Vacate. Plaintiff's motion, construed as an objection to the Court's previous rulings, is denied. Further, Plaintiff's motion, construed as again seeking to disqualify Magistrate Judge Shields is denied. Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 4/10/2023. (MR) (Entered: 04/10/2023)
04/10/2023	111	Letter from Pro Se Litigant Lidia M. Orrego dated 4/10/2023 Re: respectfully request the issues of subpoenas pursuant the Federal Rules Civil Procedure Rule 45. Subpoena (3). (GO) (Entered: 04/13/2023)
04/11/2023	110	Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration *on Order entered March 28, 2023, at 4:45 pm, pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure Rule (FRCP) Rule 7 (b)(1), Local Civil Rule 6.3, Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibits 1, # 2 Exhibits 2) (JC) (Entered: 04/11/2023)
04/12/2023		ORDER denying 106 Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's motion to compel Defendants to provide a copy of all cases or authorities since October 10, 2020 is DENIED. A review of the docket indicates that Defendants have complied with Local Civil Rule 7.2 which provides that "[i]n cases involving a pro se litigant, counsel shall, when serving a memorandum of law (or other submissions to the Court), provide the pro se litigant with copies of cases and other authorities cited therein that are unpublished or reported exclusively on computerized databases. Upon request, counsel shall provide the pro se litigant with copies of such unpublished cases and other authorities as are cited in a decision of the Court and were not previously cited by any party." Further, as Plaintiff never requested copies of any unpublished cases and/or authorities cited in any of the decisions of the Court from Defendants, Plaintiff's request is similarly denied. Going forward, should Plaintiff desire copies of such cases, Plaintiff must make a timely request to Defendants to provide such. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 4/12/2023. (DM) (Entered: 04/12/2023)
04/13/2023	112	Letter from Pro Se Office to Pro Se Litigant Lidia M. Orrego, dated 4/13/2023 Re: Response to 111 Letter. (GO) (Entered: 04/13/2023)
04/13/2023	113	Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration *on Order entered April 10, 2023, on Judicial Notice ECF 108 , pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence Rule 201 - Judicial Notice of Law and Adjudicative Facts, Federal Rule Civil Procedure Rule (FRCP) Rule 7 (b)(1), Local Civil Rule 6.3*. by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 04/13/2023)
04/20/2023	117	Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration *and Objections on Denial Without Memorandum of Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate ECF 109 on improper Order ECF 88 by Judge Shields for Lack of Specificicity and Legal Authorities - Order Entered April 10, 2023* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 04/27/2023)

04/22/2023	114	Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration *and Objections on Order entered on April 12, 2023 on Motion to Compel ECF 106* by Lidia M. Orrego. (JC) (Entered: 04/24/2023)
04/27/2023	115	NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT of Proceedings held on March 8, 2022, before Judge Anne Y. Shields. Transcriber Writer's Cramp, Inc., Telephone number 609-588-8043. Email address: wtrscramp@verizon.net. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or purchased through the Transcriber before the deadline for Release of Transcript Restriction. After that date it may be obtained through PACER. Redaction Request due 5/18/2023. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 5/29/2023. Release of Transcript Restriction set for 7/26/2023. (KS) (Entered: 04/27/2023)
04/27/2023	116	NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT of Proceedings held on July 5, 2022, before Judge Anne Y. Shields. Transcriber Writer's Cramp, Inc., Telephone number 609-588-8043. Email address: wtrscramp@verizon.net. Transcript may be viewed at the court public terminal or purchased through the Transcriber before the deadline for Release of Transcript Restriction. After that date it may be obtained through PACER. Redaction Request due 5/18/2023. Redacted Transcript Deadline set for 5/29/2023. Release of Transcript Restriction set for 7/26/2023. (KS) Modified on 4/27/2023 (KS). (Entered: 04/27/2023)
05/08/2023	118	NOTICE of Subpoenas by Lidia M. Orrego (JC) (Entered: 05/09/2023)
05/18/2023	119	ORDER OF RECUSAL. Judge Gary R. Brown recused. Case reassigned to Judge Joan M. Azrack for all further proceedings. So Ordered by Judge Gary R. Brown on 5/18/2023. (GO) **Entry was deleted and re-docketed to correct a typographical error**. (GO) (Entered: 05/19/2023)
05/24/2023	120	LETTER dated 5/24/2023 from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Azrack re Submission of Affidavits for Subpoenas. (LC) (Entered: 05/24/2023)
05/25/2023	121	MOTION to Quash by County Attorney, Nassau County. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum in Support DSS Response Letter/memo of law, # 2 Exhibit Subpoena) (McLaughlin, Brian) (Entered: 05/25/2023)
05/26/2023	122	Affirmation in Opposition to 121 MOTION to Quash Subpoena filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF) (Entered: 05/30/2023)
05/30/2023	124	MOTION to Compel */Emergency Motion to Request a Court Order to Serve by affixing a true copy of subpoena to the door of said premises which is Rebeca Uzcategui's current Counsel's Office* by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Main Document 124 replaced on 6/1/2023) (LC). (Entered: 06/01/2023)
05/31/2023	123	REPLY to Response to Motion re 121 MOTION to Quash *Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition* filed by County Attorney, Nassau County. (McLaughlin, Brian) (Entered: 05/31/2023)
06/02/2023	125	RESPONSE in Opposition re 124 MOTION to Compel */Emergency Motion to Request a Court Order to Serve by affixing a true copy of subpoena to the door of said premises which is Rebeca Uzcategui's current Counsel's Office* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 06/02/2023)
06/02/2023	126	MOTION to Seal Document 121 MOTION to Quash by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 06/02/2023)
06/02/2023	127	LETTER dated 6/2/2023 from Lida M. Orrego to Judge Shields re Affidavit of Service Subpoena refused by Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP on behalf current client and witness Ms. Rebeca Uzcategui aka Lugo. (LC) (Entered: 06/06/2023)
06/02/2023	128	Plaintiff's "REPLY and Challenge the fraudulent misrepresentation Defendants Opposition ECF doc. 125 to Plaintiff's request for a Court Order to serve by affixing a true copy of the Subpoena ECF doc. 124 ." (LC) (Entered: 06/06/2023)

06/02/2023	129	MOTION to Set Aside , MOTION to Vacate *or cancel all the Orders by H. Judge Gary R. Brown denying the Plaintiff's Motion due to judicial bias and request to expedite the ruling on pending motions* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Affirmation) (LC) (Entered: 06/06/2023)
06/06/2023	130	PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION & OPPOSITION to 126 Motion Seal the 121 Motion to Quash Subpoena filed by Lindia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 06/09/2023)
06/06/2023	131	MOTION to Vacate /"*Notice of Motion for an Order to Set Aside, Vacate or Cancel the H. Judge Gary R. Brown's Order Denying ECF doc. 35 Motion to Withdraw Answer to Amended Complaint (Pages 19 & 20) dated November 16, 2021 for Judicial Bians and Protective Order" and Affirmation in Support. Filed* by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 06/09/2023)
06/13/2023		ORDER granting 121 Motion to Quash. Non-party Nassau County Department of Social Services ("DSS") motion to quash pursuant to Rule 45(d)(3)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is GRANTED. Plaintiff's subpoena seeks information that cannot be disclosed pursuant to N.Y. SOC. SERV. LAW. § 422(5). As Plaintiff does not qualify as one of the listed entities that the information may be disclosed to, her subpoena must be quashed. Whether Plaintiff is the "source" of the report is irrelevant. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 6/13/2023. (DM) (Entered: 06/13/2023)
06/13/2023		ORDER granting 126 MOTION to Seal Document 121 MOTION to Quash . As the document found at docket entry No. [121-1] contains the names and identifying information of infants, the motion to seal the document is GRANTED and docket entry No. 121 is hereby SEALED. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 6/13/2023. (DM) (Entered: 06/13/2023)
06/13/2023		ORDER denying 124 Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's motion for an order compelling defense counsel's office to accept a subpoena on behalf of non-party Rebecca Uzcategui ("Uzcategui") is DENIED. Uzcategui is a not a party to this litigation and defense counsel does not represent her in connection with this litigation. Therefore, defense counsel cannot accept a subpoena on her behalf. Further, Uzcategui is no longer employed by Defendants or under the control of any of the Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to compel is DENIED. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 6/13/2023. (DM) (Entered: 06/13/2023)
06/14/2023	132	MOTION for Recusal *and Disqualification of Judge Anne Y. Shields* by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 06/16/2023)
06/20/2023	133	RESPONSE in Opposition re 132 MOTION for Recusal *and Disqualification of Judge Anne Y. Shields* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 06/20/2023)
06/20/2023	134	NOTICE OF SUBPOENA to T-Mobile filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 06/22/2023)
06/21/2023		ORDER denying 132 Motion for Recusal. Plaintiff's motion requesting the recusal of the undersigned is DENIED. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 6/21/2023. (DM) (Entered: 06/21/2023)
06/22/2023	135	Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' improper Opposition to the Motion Recusal of M. Judge Anne Y. Shields ECF doc. 132 , filed by pro se litigant dated 6/22/2023. (GO) (Entered: 06/23/2023)
06/23/2023	136	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE by Lidia M. Orrego re Plaintiffs' Motion to Recuse - ECF doc. 132 filed 06/14/2023 ; Defendants' Opposition improper "Letter Motion" ECF doc. 133 filed 06/20/2023; Plaintiff's Reply to improper Defendants' Opposition ECF doc. 135 filed 06/22/2023.. (LC) (Entered: 06/26/2023)
06/30/2023	137	NOTICE of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's 129 MOTION to Set Aside, MOTION to Vacate *or cancel all the Orders by H. Judge Gary R. Brown denying the Plaintiff's Motion due to judicial bias and request to expedite the ruling on pending motions* (LC) (Entered: 07/06/2023)
06/30/2023	138	NOTICE of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion ECF doc. 131 for an Order to Set Aside, Vacate or Cancel the H. Judge Gary R. Brown's Order Denying ECF doc. 35 Motion to

		Withdraw Answer to Amended Complaint (Pages 19 & 20) dated November 16, 2021 for Judicial Bias and Protective Order. (LC) (Entered: 07/06/2023)
07/01/2023	139	NOTICE of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Letter Motion ECF doc. 64 for an Order to Modify the Scheduling Order Dated August 16, 2022. (LC) (Entered: 07/06/2023)
07/01/2023	140	NOTICE of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Letter Motion ECF doc. 91 for an Order to Clarify the Ex Parte Communications Between M. Judge Anne Y. Shields' Chambers and Defendants. (LC) (Entered: 07/06/2023)
07/02/2023	141	NOTICE of Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration & Objections ECF doc. 114 filed on April 12, 2023, for an Order to Compel ECF doc. 106 . (LC) (Entered: 07/06/2023)
07/11/2023		ORDER denying 110 Motion for Reconsideration, 113 Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration, 114 Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration, 117 Notice of MOTION for Reconsideration, 129 MOTION to Set Aside MOTION to Vacate, 131 MOTION to Vacate. Before the Court are several motions filed by Plaintiff for reconsideration of various orders issued by Judge Gary R. Brown and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields. The standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is "strict," and "reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can 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." Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995) (citations omitted). "This strict standard is intended to ensure the finality of decisions and to prevent the practice of a losing party examining a decision and then plugging the gaps of a lost motion with additional matters." Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Zelik, 439 F. Supp. 3d 284, 286 (S.D.N.Y. 2020) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Accordingly, "a motion to reconsider should not be granted where the moving party seeks solely to relitigate an issue already decided." Shrader, 70 F.3d at 257. The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's submissions and concludes that she has not satisfied the "strict" standard for reconsideration. Accordingly, the motions are DENIED in their entirety. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 7/11/2023. (SP) (Entered: 07/11/2023)
07/11/2023	142	MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Quash,, "*Notice of Motion for an Order to Set Aside, Vacate, or Cancel Order filed June 13, 2023 on Motion Quash Subpoena ECF doc. 121* " by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 07/13/2023)
07/12/2023	143	AMENDED MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Quash,, "*Notice of Motion for an Order to Set Aside, Vacate, or Cancel Order filed June 13, 2023 on Motion Quash Subpoena ECF doc. 121* " by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 7/14/2023- to correct the docket from Letter to Amended. (GO). (Entered: 07/14/2023)
07/14/2023	144	MOTION for Reconsideration /"*For an Order to Set Aside, Vacate, or Cancel Order Filed June 13, 2023 on Motion to Compel Subpoena ECF doc. 124* ." by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 07/17/2023)
07/18/2023	145	MOTION to Vacate Order on Motion for Recusal /*Motion For An Order To Set Aside, Vacate, Or Cancel Order Filed June 21, 2023, Under FRCP Rule 54 (B) On Motion Recusal M. Judge Anne Y. Shields Ecf Doc. 132* , by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 07/19/2023)
07/19/2023	146	MOTION to Compel /*PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION ON DISCOVERY ORDERS*, by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Main Document 146 replaced on 8/4/2023) (LC). (Entered: 07/20/2023)
07/20/2023		ORDER denying 142 Motion for Reconsideration, 143 Letter MOTION for Reconsideration, 144 MOTION for Reconsideration, 145 MOTION to Vacate Order on Motion for Recusal. Before the Court are several objections filed by Plaintiff to various orders issued by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields. Plaintiff styles these motions as seeking reconsideration -- apparently mistakenly -- under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). However, she also states that she objects to Magistrate

		Judge Shields' orders. Accordingly, the Court construes Plaintiff's motions as presenting objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), which provides that a district court may reverse a magistrate judge's decision on a non-dispositive matter only if that decision is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon consideration of Plaintiff's objections under this highly deferential standard of review, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Shields' orders were not "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Accordingly, Plaintiff's objections are OVERRULED. For the avoidance of doubt, even if the Court were to construe Plaintiff's motions as seeking reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b) or 60, the motions would be denied because Plaintiff has not satisfied the strict standard for reconsideration. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 7/20/2023. (SP) Modified on 7/21/2023- to correct a typographical error. (GO). (Entered: 07/20/2023)
07/20/2023	147	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration */PLAINTIFFS MOTION RIGHT TO FILE AT ANY TIME FOR AN ORDER UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54 (b), TO SET ASIDE, VACATE OR CANCEL THE NOT FINAL ORDER DATED JULY 11, 2023 ON MOTIONS ECF doc. 113 , ACCORDING TO THE COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION DATED MAY 18, 2023,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/21/2023)
07/20/2023	148	Letter MOTION for Reconsideration *PLAINTIFFS MOTION RIGHT TO FILE AT ANY TIME FOR AN ORDER UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54 (b), TO SET ASIDE, VACATE OR CANCEL THE NOT FINAL ORDER DATED JULY 11, 2023 ON MOTIONS ECF doc. 110 , ACCORDING TO THE COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION DATED MAY 18, 2023* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/21/2023)
07/21/2023	149	MOTION to Vacate Order on Motion for Reconsideration,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Set Aside,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,,,,,,,,, *PLAINTIFFS MOTION RIGHT TO FILE AT ANY TIME FOR AN ORDER UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54 (b), TO SET ASIDE, VACATE OR CANCEL THE NOT FINAL ORDER DATED JULY 11, 2023 ON MOTIONS ECF doc. 117 , ACCORDING TO THE COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION DATED MAY 18, 2023* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/24/2023)
07/21/2023	150	MOTION to Vacate Order on Motion for Reconsideration,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Set Aside,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,,,,,,,,, *PLAINTIFFS MOTION RIGHT TO FILE AT ANY TIME FOR AN ORDER UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54 (b), TO SET ASIDE, VACATE OR CANCEL THE NOT FINAL ORDER DATED JULY 11, 2023 ON MOTIONS ECF doc. 129 , ACCORDING TO THE COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION DATED MAY 18, 2023* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/24/2023)
07/21/2023	151	MOTION to Vacate Order on Motion for Reconsideration,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Set Aside,,,,,,,, Order on Motion to Vacate,,,,,,,,,,,,, *PLAINTIFFS MOTION RIGHT TO FILE AT ANY TIME FOR AN ORDER UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54 (b), TO SET ASIDE, VACATE OR CANCEL THE NOT FINAL ORDER DATED JULY 11, 2023 ON MOTIONS ECF doc. 131 , ACCORDING TO THE COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION DATED MAY 18, 2023* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/24/2023)
07/21/2023	152	MOTION for Certificate of Appealability */PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CERTIFY AN ORDER FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL ON ORDERS DATED JULY 11, 2023, AND JULY 20, 2023 UNDER 28 U.S.C. 1292(b),* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 7/27/2023- document was inadvertently filed as Notice of Interlocutory Appeal instead of a Motion for Certificate of Appealability- Corrections have been made to the docket and the CA2 has been notified. (GO). (Entered: 07/27/2023)
07/21/2023		Incorrect Case/Document/Entry Information: The DE# 152 document was inadvertently filed as Notice of Interlocutory Appeal instead of a Motion for Certificate of Appealability. Corrections have been made to the docket and the Court of Appeals has been notified. There is NO Appeal filing fee due. (GO) (C/M via CM/ECF) (Entered: 07/27/2023)
07/23/2023	153	MOTION to Compel */PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CLARIFY THE ORDER JULY 20, 2023,* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/24/2023)

07/24/2023	154	MOTION for Contempt */PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CONTEMPT OF COURT CIVIL AND CRIMINAL SANCTIONS AGAINST REBECA UZCATEGUI, A/K/A REBECA LUGO, FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA ON JUNE 5, 2023 & OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 07/25/2023)
07/25/2023		ORDER granting 146 Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's motion requesting clarification of prior discovery orders is granted. On December 7, 2021, this Court issued an initial conference order scheduling a telephonic initial conference to be held on February 14, 2022 and included this Court's individual rules and template discovery schedules as examples for the attorneys to review and confer about prior to submitting a joint proposed discovery schedule and joint initial letter for the Court's review before the scheduled initial conference. Upon review the Court declined to adopt the joint proposed discovery schedule. Rather, the Court directed counsel to complete the undersigned's Employment Protocols by April 12, 2022, cancelled the initial conference, and scheduled a status conference for April 19, 2022. However, on February 14, 2022, Plaintiff filed a letter requesting a substitution of counsel. As a result, a conference was held, Plaintiff's counsel was relieved, and Plaintiff ultimately proceeded in this case pro se. On April 19, 2022, in response to Plaintiff's request to remove this Court's prior discovery orders, the undersigned vacated the initial conference order which rendered the discovery scheduling order directing that the Employment Protocols be completed by April 12, 2022 moot. The undersigned also set forth a new Tier I discovery schedule. However, once again, due to Plaintiff's request for an in-person initial conference rather than a Tier I discovery schedule to initiate discovery, the undersigned vacated the newly issued Tier I discovery schedule and scheduled an in-person initial conference for July 5, 2022. During the July 5, 2022, all parties were given ample time to request any Phase I discovery they sought and a Phase I discovery schedule was entered. HIPAA authorizations were not requested. This Court does not order settlement conferences as part of discovery schedules. If all parties agree, they may request a settlement conference. In light of Plaintiff's representation that she is interested in a settlement conference, Plaintiff and defense counsel are directed to confer, and by August 1, 2023, submit a joint letter on ECF advising this Court whether all parties request such a conference. Finally, the following discovery schedule is now in effect: All discovery in this case shall be completed by November 1, 2023. Any party seeking to make a dispositive motion shall initiate that process, consistent with the undersigned's individual rules, on or before December 1, 2023. The joint proposed pre-trial order shall be filed on January 4, 2024, or, in the event that a dispositive motion is made, 30 days after a final decision on the motion is rendered. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 7/25/2023. (DM) (Entered: 07/25/2023)
07/26/2023	155	Letter *Opposition to Plaintiff's Petition/Motion for Certification of an Interlocutory Appeal (ECF No. 152)* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 07/26/2023)
07/26/2023	156	Letter from Pro Se Litigant dated 7/26/2023 Re: COMPLIANCE ORDER M. JUDGE ANNE Y. SHIELDS ORDER DATED JULY 25, 2023. I, Lidia M. Orrego, Plaintiff, respectfully submit a copy of the email to schedule the conference with the Defendants. (GO) (Entered: 07/28/2023)
07/26/2023	157	Letter from Pro Se Litigant dated 7/27/2023 Re: PLAINTIFF'S CONFIRMATION OF CLOSING DISCOVERY AND REQUEST MOVE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON NOVEMBER 1, 2023. (GO) (Entered: 07/28/2023)
07/26/2023	158	Letter from Pro Se Litigant dated 7/26/2023 Re: PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSAL RETURN DAY ON PENDING MOTIONS. (GO) (Entered: 07/28/2023)
07/26/2023	159	Letter from Pro Se Litigant 7/26/2023 dated Re: PLAINTIFF'S CERTIFICATION ON HIPAA AUTHORIZATIONS & STATEMENT ON MAGISTRATE JUDGE SHIELDS' ORDER JULY

		25, 2023. (GO) (Entered: 07/28/2023)
07/28/2023		ORDER denying 152 Motion for Certificate of Appealability. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), a district judge may certify an interlocutory appeal if the party seeking certification demonstrates that the order to be appealed from "involves a controlling question of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and... an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation." The party seeking leave to appeal bears the burden of establishing all three substantive criteria. See Casey v. Long Island R.R., 406 F.3d 142, 146 (2d Cir. 2005). Moreover, that party must show "exceptional circumstances to overcome the general aversion to piecemeal litigation and justify a departure from the basic policy of postponing appellate review until after the entry of a final judgment." Robinson v. De Niro, No. 19-CV-09156, 2023 WL 4561590, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. July 17, 2023) (internal quotations marks and citation omitted). Even where the statutory criteria are met, a district court retains "broad discretion to deny certification[.]" Nat'l Asbestos Workers Med. Fund v. Philip Morris, Inc., 71 F. Supp. 2d 139, 166 (E.D.N.Y. 1999). Here, Plaintiff asserts that the Court's July 11, 2023 and July 20, 2023 Orders satisfy the requirements of § 1292(b). However, because the Court disagrees that there is "substantial ground for difference of opinion" regarding any legal issues raised in the Orders -- including the underlying orders of Judge Brown and Magistrate Judge Shields -- the Court declines Plaintiff's request to certify these Orders for immediate interlocutory appeal. In light of Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court notes that to the extent she appeals from an interlocutory order, see 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), she need not seek this Court's leave to file an appeal. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 7/28/2023. (SP) (Entered: 07/28/2023)
07/31/2023	160	STATUS REPORT by Lidia M. Orrego. (LC) (Entered: 07/31/2023)
08/01/2023	161	STATUS REPORT by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/01/2023)
08/01/2023	162	LETTER dated 8/1/2023 from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Shields re Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' Letter ECF doc. 161 Status Report Conference - Magistrate Judge Shields Order dated July 25, 2023. (LC) (Entered: 08/02/2023)
08/01/2023	163	MOTION to Compel /*PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION & MOTION TO CLARIFY THE ORDER JULY 28, 2023 ON MOTION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY ECF DOC. 152* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) Modified on 3/18/2024 (LC). (Entered: 08/03/2023)
08/01/2023	164	Letter from Pro Se Litigant to Judge Shields dated 8/1/2023 Re: Re: Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' Letter ECF doc. 161 Status Report Conference - Magistrate Judge Shields' Order dated July 25, 2023. (GO) (Entered: 08/03/2023)
08/02/2023		SCHEDULING ORDER: Upon review of the parties' letters it is clear that a settlement conference would not be fruitful. Accordingly, no settlement conference will be scheduled at this time. The parties are reminded that all discovery in this case must be completed by November 1, 2023 and any party seeking to make a dispositive motion shall initiate that process, consistent with the undersigned's individual rules, on or before December 1, 2023. So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields on 8/2/2023. (DM) (Entered: 08/02/2023)
08/02/2023	168	LETTER dated 8/2/2023 from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Shields Re: Plaintiff's Letter Clarification on Defendants Failure to Comply with the Magistrate Judge Shields' Individuals Rules VIII. Settlement Conferences A, B, C & request to comply the rules. (LC) (Entered: 08/07/2023)
08/03/2023	165	Letter from Pro Se Litigant to Judge Shields dated 8/3/2023 Re: Re: Plaintiff's Letter Motion request instructions to submit evidentiary records "Plaintiff's Records" to comply with Order dated August 2, 2023. (GO) (Entered: 08/04/2023)
08/03/2023	166	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL by Lidia M. Orrego. (CL) (Entered: 08/04/2023)

08/04/2023	167	USCA Appeal Fees received $ 505 receipt number 200002102 re 166 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego (CL) (Entered: 08/04/2023)
08/04/2023		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 166 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: 08/04/2023)
08/11/2023	169	Letter from Pro Se Office to Pro Se Litigant dated 8/11/2023 Re: the enclosed disk is being returned without docketing or consideration. (GO) (Entered: 08/11/2023)
10/04/2023	170	MOTION for Order to Show Cause *FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER* by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Additional attachment(s) added on 10/6/2023: # 1 Exhibit 1-2, # 2 Sealing Cover Sheet) (GO). (Attachment 2 replaced on 10/6/2023) (GO). (Entered: 10/06/2023)
10/06/2023		ORDER denying 170 Motion for Order to Show Cause. On October 4, 2023, Plaintiff motioned for an order to show cause for a preliminary injunction and a temporary restraining order. Based on the representations in DE 170 , the motion is denied. Plaintiff's current filing is the improper vehicle to raise discovery disputes. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/6/2023. (JSB) (Entered: 10/06/2023)
10/12/2023	171	LETTER dated 10/12/2023 from Lidia M. Orrego to Judge Azrack re "Plaintiff's Request for Admissions served to Defendants". (LC) (Entered: 10/17/2023)
10/16/2023		Incorrect Case/Document/Entry Information. The 172 Letter has been deleted from the above-referenced case as it was entered in the incorrect case number; the document has been docketed in 23-cv-6507. (LC) (Entered: 10/17/2023)
10/23/2023	173	Letter MOTION to Unseal Document 170 MOTION for Order to Show Cause *FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER* filed by Lidia M. Orrego *(exhibits 1 to 7)* by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF) (Entered: 10/27/2023)
10/26/2023	174	MOTION for leave to allow Pro Se to Electronically File by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF) (Entered: 10/27/2023)
10/30/2023		ORDER denying 174 Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File. Before the Court is an application from pro se 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 uploading of voluminous and/or improper documents on Box.com in her other case pending under Docket Number 23-CV-3507 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)
10/30/2023		ORDER denying 173 Motion to Unseal Document. Pro Se Plaintiff's application to unseal documents is denied. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB) (Entered: 10/30/2023)
11/03/2023	175	LETTER dated 11/2/2023 from Pro Se Office to pro se litigant. The enclosed document is being returned without docketing or consideration for the following reason(s): The papers appear to be intended for another court or agency. (LC) (Entered: 11/03/2023)
11/03/2023	176	NOTICE OF PETITION OF WRIT SERVED TO COURT OF APPEALS - 23-7643 - Lidia M. Orrego. (CL) (Entered: 11/07/2023)
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. (See 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. See 23-7643 (2d Cir. Oct. 31, 2023). Accordingly, given Plaintiff's pending appeals and in an abundance of caution in light of her pro se 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 in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 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	177	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)
11/29/2023	178	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion to Unseal Document, Order, Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Notice of Appeal - Part 2, # 2 Notice of Appeal - Part 3) (CL) (Entered: 11/29/2023)
11/29/2023	179	USCA Appeal Fees received $ 505 receipt number 200002638 re 178 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. 178 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)
02/13/2024	180	MANDATE of USCA 23-1114 as to 166 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego. This Court has determined sua sponte that it lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the districtcourt has not issued a final order as contemplated by 28 U.S.C. § 1291. See Petrello v. White,533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the appealis DISMISSED. (CL) (Entered: 02/13/2024)
02/21/2024	181	LETTER dated 2/21/2024 from Lidia M. 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). Case should remain stayed according to the order dated 11/14/2023, 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." See 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." See 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. See ECF No. 180 in 20-CV-3361. However, the Interlocutory Appeal filed in 23-CV-6507 remains pending. See 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 in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 2/27/2024. (JSB) (Entered: 02/27/2024)
03/18/2024		ORDER. By Order dated November 14, 2023, the Court stayed this case, No. 20-CV-3361 ("2020 Case"), together with Plaintiff's other related case, No. 23-CV-6057 ("2023 Case"), pending the Second Circuit's resolution of the interlocutory appeals Plaintiff filed in both cases. Notwithstanding that Order, Plaintiff continued to file papers in both cases. Accordingly, by Electronic Order dated February 27, 2024, in both cases, the Court reminded Plaintiff 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."** (emphasis in original). Further, the Court noted that, "by Mandate issued on February 13, 2024, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed the Interlocutory Appeal filed in [the 2020 case]. See ECF No. 180 in [the 2020 Case.] However, the Interlocutory Appeal filed in [the 2023 Case] remains pending. See ECF No. 30 in [the 2023 Case]. Plaintiff shall file a letter not exceeding three pages requesting that the stay be lifted upon resolution of the remaining interlocutory appeal." See Elec. Order, dated February 27, 2024, in both cases. Thus, given the interlocutory appeal remains pending in the 2023 Case, which the Court views as inextricably related to the present 2020 Case, Plaintiff's motions in this case (ECF Nos. 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 163, and 172) are administratively terminated. Within two (2) weeks of the Second Circuit issuing its Mandate on her remaining appeal in the 2023 Case, Plaintiff may move to: (1) lift the stays in the present 2020 Case and her 2023 Case; and (2) reinstate the above-referenced motions. **Plaintiff is ON NOTICE: FAILURE TO TIMELY REQUEST REINSTATEMENT OF THESE MOTIONS WILL RESULT IN THEIR NOT BEING CONSIDERED BY THE COURT.** 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 in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 3/18/2024. (JSB) (Entered: 03/18/2024)
04/29/2024		ORDER. By Order dated November 14, 2023, the Court stayed this case, No. 20-CV-3361 ("2020 Case"), together with Plaintiff's other related case, No. 23-CV-6057 ("2023 Case"),

		pending the Second Circuit's resolution of the interlocutory appeals Plaintiff filed in both cases. As it stands, Plaintiff's interlocutory appeal remains pending in the 2023 Case. Plaintiff filed multiple appeals in the 2020 case, all of which remain pending. Plaintiff's appeals in Docket Nos. 23-7941 and 23-7643, for example, await resolution by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ("Second Circuit"). Although the Second Circuit dismissed Plaintiff's Interlocutory Appeal filed in Docket No. 23-1114, (see ECF No. 180 in the 2020 Case), Plaintiff has filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States, thereby appealling the Second Circuit's dismissal. Given the interlocutory appeal remains pending in the 2023 Case (which the Court views as inextricably related to the present 2020 Case) and Plaintiff's multiple appeals in the 2020 case remain pending before either the Second Circuit or the Supreme Court of the United States, Plaintiff's motions in this case (ECF Nos. 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 163, and 172) **REMAIN** administratively terminated. Within two (2) weeks of the resolution of **ALL HER APPEALS** in the Second Circuit **AND** the UNited States Supreme Court, Plaintiff may move to: (1) lift the stays in the present 2020 Case and her 2023 Case; and (2) reinstate the above-referenced motions. Plaintiff is again **ON NOTICE: FAILURE TO TIMELY REQUEST REINSTATEMENT OF THESE MOTIONS WILL RESULT IN THEIR NOT BEING CONSIDERED BY THE COURT.** 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 in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 4/29/2024. (JSB) (Entered: 04/29/2024)
04/30/2024	182	LETTER dated 4/30/2024 from K. Santana to pro se litigant. The enclosed document is being returned without docketing or consideration for the following reasons(s): Other: Pursuant to the 3/18/2024 Order. Please see the enclosed docket sheet. (LC) (Entered: 04/30/2024)
06/04/2024	183	MANDATE of USCA 23-7643 as to 178 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. Petitioner, pro se, has filed a petition for writs of mandamus, prohibition, and certiorari. Upondue consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the petition is DENIED because Petitioner has notdemonstrated that her right to the writ of mandamus is clear and indisputable, and that grantingthe writ is appropriate under the circumstances, and because the writ of prohibition may only beused for the purpose of keeping [an] inferior court within the limits of its jurisdiction. Pan Am.Petrol. Corp. v. Superior Ct. of Del. In & For New Castle Cnty., 366 U.S. 656, 657 n.1 (1961); seeCheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367, 38081 (2004). (CL) (Entered: 06/04/2024)
11/22/2024	184	MANDATE of USCA 23-7941 as to 178 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal, filed by Lidia M. Orrego. Appellees, through counsel, move to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. Appellant, pro se, moves to strike Appellees' motion. This Court has determined that it lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because a final order has not been issued by the district court as contemplated by 28 U.S.C. § 1291. See Petrello v. White, 533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that Appellee's motion is GRANTED and the appeal is DISMISSED. It is further ORDERED that Appellant's motion is DENIED as moot. (KS) (Entered: 11/22/2024)
12/06/2024	185	Notice of Related Cases: 24-cv-7247-JMA-AYS and 23-cv-6507-JMA-AYS **The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case.** (DC) (Entered: 12/06/2024)
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	186	MOTION to Compel *Re: Plaintiffs Request to Lift the Stays in the 2020 and 2023 Cases and Reinstate Motions* by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 02/06/2025)
02/12/2025	187	Notice of Related Case: 25-cv-00736 **The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case.** (KS) (Entered: 02/12/2025)
02/14/2025	188	Notice of Related Case: 25-cv-00769 **The Case was directly assigned as a related Pro Se/Habeas Case.** (KS) (Entered: 02/14/2025)
03/03/2025	189	ORDER: Plaintiff has moved to lift the stay in this case and reinstate nine administratively terminated motions 186 . For the reasons stated in the attached, the motion to lift the stay is granted. The motion to reinstate Plaintiff's prior motions is denied. The parties are directed to meet and confer and submit a proposed schedule for the completion of discovery to Judge Shields by **3/17/2025**. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 3/3/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 03/03/2025)
03/13/2025	190	MOTION to Stay , MOTION to Disqualify Counsel , MOTION for Preliminary Injunction , MOTION for Temporary Restraining Order by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 03/13/2025)
03/17/2025	191	STATUS REPORT *In Response to the Court's Order Dated March 3, 2025* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 03/17/2025)
03/17/2025	192	REPLY in Opposition re 191 Status Report filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 03/18/2025)
03/19/2025		ORDER: The Court adopts the proposed briefing schedule 191 . Any party seeking to move for summary judgment must serve its motion by **6/9/2025**; any opposition must be served by **7/14/2025**; and any reply must be served by **8/4/2025**. The parties should serve the papers on each other by these deadlines but only file them on the Court's docket on **8/4/2025**, following service of all briefs. The parties are otherwise reminded to follow Judge Bulsara's Individual Practices and the Local Civil Rules effective 1/2/2025. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 3/19/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 03/19/2025)
03/26/2025	193	Letter dated 3/26/2025 from Lidia M. Orrego addressed to District Judge Bulsara RE: Status of Motion to Stay, Motion for Disqualification for Fraud, Perjury, Tampering with Witness and Evidence, Preliminary Injunction, and Protective Order (Docket Entry 190), filed on March 13, 2025. (AMF) (Entered: 03/26/2025)
05/09/2025	194	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference *for Motion to Vacate Summary Judgment Scheduling Order, Stay Case, Disqualify Opposing Counsel, Provide Evidence Filing Instructions, and Renew Declaratory Judgment* by Lidia M. Orrego. (AMF) (Entered: 05/09/2025)
05/23/2025	195	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File *(Consent letter motion for extension of time with respect to all deadlines set forth in the summary judgment motion briefing schedule)* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 05/23/2025)
05/27/2025		ORDER: The motion for extension of time to file document 195 is granted. The deadlines are extended as follows: any party seeking to move for summary judgment must serve its motion by **7/9/2025**; any opposition must be served by **8/13/2025**; and any reply must be served by **9/3/2025**. The parties are directed to serve the papers on each other by these deadlines but only file them on the Court's docket on **9/3/2025**, following services of all briefs. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 5/27/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 05/27/2025)
06/17/2025	196	Second MOTION to Disqualify Judge */NOTICE OF SECOND MOTION TO RECUSE MAGISTRATE JUDGE ANNE Y. SHIELDS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 AND 455 AND FRCP 7(b), 72(b), AND EDNY LOCAL CIVIL RULE 7.1* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/18/2025)

06/17/2025	197	Notice of MOTION to Vacate *ORDERS PURSUANT TO FRCP 60(b)(2), 60(b)(6), AND 60(d)(3)* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/18/2025	198	Notice of MOTION to Vacate *ORDERS PURSUANT TO FRCP 60(b)(2), 60(b)(6), AND 60(d)(3)* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 06/18/2025)
06/30/2025	199	MOTION for Declaratory Judgment *(Declaratory Relief)* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Part 2, # 2 Part 3) (NF) (Entered: 07/01/2025)
07/01/2025	200	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply */Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/02/2025)
07/02/2025		ORDER: Plaintiff's motion for declaratory judgment 199 is denied. The motion was previously denied on 3/28/2023. Plaintiff has now filed a renewed motion, which is just a motion for reconsideration. As such, the motion is late because more than 14 days have passed since the prior denial. See Local Civil Rule 6.3. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/2/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/02/2025)
07/03/2025	201	RESPONSE to Motion re 200 Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply */Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule* filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 07/03/2025)
07/07/2025		ORDER: The motion for extension of time 200 is granted. The summary judgment briefing is extended as follows: any party seeking to move for summary judgment must serve its motion by **8/8/2025**; any opposition must be served by **9/12/2025**; and any reply must be served by **10/3/2025**. The parties are directed to serve the papers on each other by these deadlines but only file them on the Court's docket on **10/3/2025**, following service of all briefs. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/7/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/07/2025)
07/07/2025	202	Notice of Request to Submit Electronic Evidence. re 200 Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply */Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025	203	Notice of MOTION to Disqualify Judge */Recuse*, Notice of MOTION to Vacate *July 2, 2025 Order* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER: The Court has received from Plaintiff multiple requests to submit electronic evidence. The protocol for submission of large electronic files set forth in the Court's Individual Practices § II.D, however, is only to be utilized for trial or motion practice where exhibits are appropriate for the Court's consideration of the issues involved, such as summary judgment. Both sides are therefore informed that, outside of such limited practice, documents should be filed only on ECF. Emails to Chambers are generally prohibited. *See* Individual Practices § II.B. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/8/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025		ORDER: Plaintiff has filed multiple motions, *e.g.*, motions to disqualify opposing counsel, motions to stay, motions to vacate prior orders, and a motion to disqualify Judge Shields 190 , 194 , 196 , 197 , 198 , 200 . Many of these motions are attempts to relitigate issues already decided in this case. The proper vehicle for such action is to file an appeal at the appropriate time with the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. This Court will not reconsider or undo any order issued by a prior judge in this case from before its transfer to the undersigned. Accordingly, Plaintiff may not file any further motions seeking reconsideration or a redo of prior decisions. At this point in the litigation, the parties are briefing cross-motions for summary judgment—motions which the Court will decide in a timely fashion and which will determine whether this case proceeds to trial or judgment in favor of Plaintiff or Defendants. Filings unrelated to summary judgment—which attempt to relitigate prior decisions—distract from orderly and

		efficient resolution of the case to a final disposition. Should Plaintiff continue to file motions for reconsideration (or motions in the guise of reconsideration motions) the Court may unfortunately have to prohibit and suspend her ECF filing privileges. *See Trivedi v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, No. 23-254, 2024 WL 3286663, at *2 (2d Cir. July 3, 2024) (warning pro se litigant "if she continues to abuse the judicial process by the instigation of frivolous appeals, an injunction will issue directing the Clerk of this Court to refuse to accept for filing any submissions from her, unless she has first obtained leave of the Court to file such papers." (cleaned up) (quoting *Sassower v. Sansverie*, 885 F.2d 9, 11 (2d Cir. 1989)). This is a step the Court does not wish to take but may have no choice. (Of course, because the summary judgment motions have not yet been decided, Plaintiff may file a motion for reconsideration, consistent with Local Rule 6.3, should she disagree with some aspect of the decision rendered on such motions). Because the motions attempt to relitigate all of the issues previously decided in this case, well after the time for reconsideration, *see* Local Civil Rule 6.3, the motions at Docket Nos. 190 , 194 , 196 , 197 , 198 , 200 are all denied. The Court will proceed to resolve the summary judgment motions following submission of those papers consistent with the briefing schedule (as amended by the Court). So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/8/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/10/2025	204	Letter Motion Objection and Clarification to Order Dated July 8, 2025 (NF) (Entered: 07/10/2025)
07/11/2025		ORDER: The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff's letter motion objection to its prior order 204 . To be clear, the Court is not imposing any restriction on Plaintiff's ability to make any argument (or present any evidence) in support of her motion for summary judgment (or in opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment). The only restriction on summary judgment is on the length of the memoranda of law, which has word limits, by virtue of Local Civil Rule 7.1. And Plaintiff (and Defendants) may submit evidence, in the form of Rule 56.1 statements (and exhibits thereto), in connection with summary judgment. What Plaintiff (and Defendants) cannot do is relitigate or reargue decisions that have already been made—which is why the Court denied the motions to reconsider decisions which, in some instances, were made years ago. Such reconsideration is barred by Local Civil Rule 6.3, which requires reconsideration motions to be filed within 14 days of the initial decision (and reconsideration may only be sought once). To reconsider decisions already made, as previously noted, requires the Court to move backwards, and prevents the case from moving forward. To the extent that Plaintiff has new evidence, it should be presented in connection with the summary judgment briefing. The Court looks forward to reviewing and deciding the summary judgment papers so the case can either proceed to trial or be resolved at this stage. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/11/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/11/2025)
07/21/2025	206	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	205	Letter MOTION to Vacate *Orders Dated July 8, 2025, For Recusal of District Judge Bulsara and Magistrate Judge Shields for Due Process Violations, For Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint, to Stay Proceedings, and to Vacate any Summary Judgment Scheduling Order* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/24/2025		ORDER: For the reasons stated in the Court's previous Orders, including on 7/8/2025 and 7/11/2025, the motion to vacate 205 is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/24/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/24/2025)
08/05/2025	207	Emergency MOTION to Vacate *Objecting to Order Dated July 24, 2025, Denying DE 205 , for Due Process Violations Arising from Orders Dated July 8, 2025, and July 11, 2025, Reaffirmation of Recusal of District Judge Bulsara and M. Judge Shields, to Vacate Schedule for Summary Judgment Due to Defendants' Fraud Confirmed by NYS ATTORNEY GENERAL LETITIA JAMES, and Relief Requested in DE 205 - To Set the Record of Due Process Violations and Judicial Impropriety* by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/05/2025)

08/08/2025	208	Letter *regarding service of Defendants' motion for summary judgment on Plaintiff* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/11/2025	209	NOTICE of Filing of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/14/2025	210	ORDER: The motion 207 is 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. (MPG) (Entered: 08/14/2025)
09/09/2025	211	MOTION for Leave to File Document *New Proceedings Based on New Evidence - Workers' Compensation Fraud by Shimmee Inc. and Others; Deprivation of Rights by Attorney General Letitia James and Governor Kathy Hochul* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 09/11/2025)
09/11/2025	212	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to 210 Order on Motion to Vacate, by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/11/2025	213	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Main Document 213 replaced on 9/22/2025) (LF). (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/15/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 212 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	214	ORDER: On September 11, 2025, Lidia Orrego, acting pro se, filed a Notice of Interlocutory Appeal 212 of this Court's August 14, 2025 Order 210 together with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") 213 . 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 213 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. (RB) (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. 211 , 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. (RB) (Entered: 09/16/2025)

09/18/2025	215	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	216	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/23/2025)
09/22/2025		Supplemental Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 212 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. (LF) (Entered: 09/22/2025)
09/23/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 212 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	217	Letter MOTION for Leave to Appeal *order of the court entered on September 16, 2025* by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
09/30/2025	218	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
09/30/2025	219	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 *in forma pauperis* 216 is denied. "An appeal may not be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." *Romero v. DHL Express, Inc.*, 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. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 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. *See Coppedge*, 369 U.S. at 444-45. The application to proceed *in forma pauperis* 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. (RB) (Entered: 10/01/2025)
10/01/2025	220	NEF received from Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (USCA #25-2399) re Petition for Writ Served. (Attachments: # 1 Part 2) (LF) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
10/02/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 219 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. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)

10/03/2025	221	MOTION for Summary Judgment by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Attachments: # 1 Rule 56.1 Statement, # 2 Declaration, # 3 Exhibit A - Plaintiff's Deposition, # 4 Exhibit B - Savitsky WCB Testimony, # 5 Exhibit C - Old Westbury Eddie, LLC, record of Incorporation, # 6 Exhibit D - Test Msgs, # 7 Exhibit E - Job Offer Letter, # 8 Exhibit F - Non-Disclosure Agreement, # 9 Exhibit G - Plaintiff's WC Application, # 10 Exhibit H - Plaintiff's Text Msgs, # 11 Exhibit I - Email Report 4, # 12 Exhibit J - Plaintiff's diary, # 13 Exhibit K - Plaintiff's Pavillion Agency Resume, # 14 Exhibit L - Plaintiff's March 5, 2021 WCB Hearing Testimony, # 15 Exhibit M - Text Msgs, # 16 Exhibit N - Plaintiff's October 26, 2018 Wage Statement, # 17 Exhibit O - November 2, 2018 Complaint, # 18 Exhibit P - Email Report 1, # 19 Exhibit Q - Email Report 2, # 20 Exhibit R - Email Report 3, # 21 Exhibit S - Email Report 5, # 22 Exhibit T - Email Report 6, # 23 Exhibit U - Email Report 7, # 24 Exhibit V - Email from Testa to Plaintiff re Investigation, # 25 Exhibit W - Email from Kevin Flannagan, # 26 Exhibit X - Termination Letter, # 27 Exhibit Y - Imange of E-Folder Containing Photographs, # 28 Exhibit Z - Imange of E-Folder Containing Videos, # 29 Exhibit AA - September 30, 2021 MTD Decision, # 30 Exhibit BB - March 10 2021 WCB Decision, # 31 Exhibit CC - June 21, 2021 WCB Board Panel Decision, # 32 Exhibit DD - November 2, 2023 Third Department Decision, # 33 Exhibit EE - Plaintiff's June 2021 Inspector General Complaint, # 34 Exhibit FF - Plaintiff's June 2021 NYSDOH Complaint, # 35 Exhibit GG - Plaintiff's July 2021 NYSCJC Complaint, # 36 Exhibit HH 0 Plaintiff's February 2023 State Court Complaint, # 37 Exhibit II - Transcript of February 2025 Proceeding, # 38 Exhibit JJ - April 2025 Decision, # 39 Exhibit KK - April 2025 Dismissal, # 40 Exhibit LL - Plaintiff's July 2024 State Court Complaint, # 41 Exhibit MM - June 2020 NCDSS Notice Ltrs, # 42 Exhibit NN - July 2020 NYS OCFS ltrs, # 43 Exhibit OO - Plaintiff's December 2020 Complaint against Debra Karpfntiff's March 2024 Ltr to NCDSS, # 44 Exhibit PP- Plaintiff's March 2024 Ltr to NCDSS, # 45 Exhibit QQ - Plaintiff's December 2024 Nassau County Article 78 Petition, # 46 Exhibit RR - April 2025 Nassau County Supreme Court Decision, # 47 Exhibit SS - Plaintiff's March 2021 Queens County Supreme Court Complaint, # 48 Exhibit TT - July 2025 Second Department Decision, # 49 Exhibit UU - March 2021 NYSDHR Determination and Order of Dismissal of Administrative Convenience, # 50 Exhibit VV - Plaintiff's August 2021 Queens County Supreme Court Complaint against Ley Family, # 51 Exhibit WW - Plaintiff's June 2020 Letter to the Derek Smith Law Group, # 52 Exhibit XX - Plaintiff's June 2020 Letter to Borrelli & Associates, # 53 Exhibit YY - Plaintiff's April 2020 Letter to Law Office of Peter A. Romero, # 54 Memorandum in Support, # 55 Exhibit Notice to Pro Se Litigation Who Opposed a Motion for Summary Judgment) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/03/2025)
10/03/2025	222	REPLY in Support re 221 MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/03/2025)
10/03/2025	223	Letter MOTION for Leave to File Document *Motion for Summary Judgment* by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 10/03/2025)
10/03/2025	224	AFFIRMATION of Lidia M. Orrego in Opposition re 221 Defendants' MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Affidavit in Support of Authentication of Evidence and Certifications Government Agencies, # 2 Plaintiff's Counterstatement of Material Facts Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 56.1 in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, # 3 Memorandum of Law in Opposition Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, # 4 Exhibit 1, # 5 Exhibit 2, # 6 Exhibit 3, # 7 Exhibit 4, # 8 Exhibit 5, # 9 Exhibit 6, # 10 Exhibit 7, # 11 Exhibit 8, # 12 Exhibit 9, # 13 Exhibit 10, # 14 Exhibit 11, # 15 Exhibit 12, # 16 Exhibit 13, # 17 Exhibit 14, # 18 Exhibit 15, # 19 Exhibit 16, # 20 Exhibit 17, # 21 Exhibit 18, # 22 Exhibit 19, # 23 Exhibit 20, # 24 Exhibit 21, # 25 Exhibit 22, # 26 Exhibit 24, # 27 Exhibit 25, # 28 Exhibit 26, # 29 Exhibit 27, # 30 Exhibit 28, # 31 Exhibit 29, # 32 Exhibit 30, # 33 Exhibit 31, # 34 Exhibit 32, # 35 Exhibit 33, # 36 Exhibit 34, # 37 Exhibit 35, # 38 Exhibit 36, # 39 Exhibit 37, # 40 Exhibit 38, # 41 Exhibit 39, # 42 Exhibit 40, # 43 Exhibit 41, # 44 Affirmation of Service) (NF) (Entered: 10/06/2025)

10/06/2025		ORDER: Pro se Plaintiff Orrego's request for leave to file her fully briefed motion for summary judgment 223 is denied as moot. Orrego's summary judgment motion is not subject to the Court's August 14, 2025 filing injunction 210 , and permission is not required to file. The Clerk is directed to docket the summary judgment briefing. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 10/6/2025. (RB) (Entered: 10/06/2025)
10/06/2025	225	Letter *requesting the Clerk to (i) reclassify Plaintiff's filing (ECF No. 209) from a Notice to a Motion for Summary Judgment, or (ii) advise how the opposition should be filed under the current classification of same* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/06/2025)
10/06/2025	226	Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment, # 2 Affirmation of Lidia M.Orrego in Support of Local Rule 56.1 Statement and Motion for Summary Judgment, # 3 Plaintiff's Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, # 4 Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # 5 List Exhibits Summary Judgment, # 6 Exhibit 1, # 7 Exhibit 2, # 8 Exhibit 3, # 9 Exhibit 4, # 10 Exhibit 5, # 11 Exhibit 6, # 12 Exhibit 7, # 13 Exhibit 8, # 14 Exhibit 9, # 15 Exhibit 10, # 16 Exhibit 11, # 17 Exhibit 12, # 18 Exhibit 13, # 19 Exhibit 14, # 20 Exhibit 15, # 21 Exhibit 16, # 22 Exhibit 17, # 23 Exhibit 18, # 24 Exhibit 19, # 25 Exhibit 20, # 26 Exhibit 21, # 27 Exhibit 22, # 28 Exhibit 23, # 29 Exhibit 24, # 30 Exhibit 25, # 31 Exhibit 26) (NF) (Entered: 10/07/2025)
10/06/2025	227	DECLARATION OF Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh in Opposition re Plaintiff's 226 Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # 2 Defendant's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # 3 Defendant's Responses to Plaintiff's Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, # 4 Exhibit ZZ) (NF) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/06/2025	228	REPLY in Support re 226 Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 Plaintiff's Affirmation of Authentication of Exhibits 26-47, # 2 Plaintiff's Reply Defendants' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Fated September 12, 2025, # 3 Plaintiff's Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, # 4 Exhibit 26, # 5 Exhibit 27, # 6 Exhibit 28, # 7 Exhibit 29, # 8 Exhibit 30, # 9 Exhibit 31, # 10 Exhibit 32, # 11 Exhibit 33, # 12 Exhibit 34, # 13 Exhibit 35, # 14 Exhibit 36, # 15 Exhibit 37, # 16 Exhibit 38, # 17 Exhibit 39, # 18 Exhibit 40, # 19 Exhibit 41, # 20 Exhibit 42, # 21 Exhibit 43, # 22 Exhibit 44, # 23 Exhibit 45, # 24 Exhibit 46, # 25 Exhibit 47) (NF) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/06/2025	229	NOTICE: The Clerks Office received the attached USB in support of 226 , 227 and 228 ; Original USB and has been sent to Judge Bulsara's chambers. (GO) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/06/2025		The Clerks Office is in receipt of the Pro Se Filings 226 , 227 and 228 . The cover letter states that the pro se litigant included the following: "4. Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (served September 12, 2025) Pages 1 - 1004"; AND "USB Flash Drive "EASTFUN" 32GB Blue Submission". After careful review of the documents, the clerks office was NOT provided with said documents. (GO) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/21/2025	230	MOTION for Leave to File Document *a Sur-Reply or Motion to Strike Based on Defendants' Non-Compliance with Local Rule 56.1(c), Warranting Admission of Plaintiff's Facts Under Rule 56.1(d), and to Strike 129-178 Pursuant to FRCP 12(f), FRCP 37, and FRE 403; and, for the record, Leave Noted Regarding the Court's Refusal of Plaintiff's Revised Opposition Under FRCP 15(a)(2) - "freely give[n] when justice so requires" (DE 115) attached Filed October 10, 2025, Returned October 20, 2025*. by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 10/21/2025)
10/21/2025	231	Letter in Response/Clarification to 10/6/2025 Docket Entry by Lidia M. Orrego (NF) (Entered: 10/22/2025)
10/22/2025		ORDER: The motion for leave 230 to file a sur-reply or motion to strike is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 10/22/2025. (RB) (Entered: 10/22/2025)

11/05/2025		ORDER: In light of the impending reassignment of this case, the current motions, 203 , 217 , 218 , 221 , and 226 , are deemed withdrawn and should be refiled consistent with the individual practices of the new Judge(s) and only with permission of the newly assigned Judge(s). So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 11/5/2025. (RB) (Entered: 11/05/2025)
11/17/2025		ORDER OF RECUSAL. Type of Recusal: party. Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 11/17/2025. Judge Sanket J. Bulsara, Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields recused. Case randomly reassigned to Judge Pamela K. Chen and Magistrate Judge Taryn A. Merkl for all further proceedings. (BBM) (Entered: 11/17/2025)
11/18/2025	232	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference *(Urgent Request) To Vacate Unlawful Pre-Filing Injunctions and to Restore Constitutional and Satutory Filing Rights/w-Exhibits) filed* by Lidia M. Orrego. (MLR) (Entered: 11/20/2025)
11/26/2025		Case Reassigned to Judge Sanket J. Bulsara and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields. Judge Pamela K. Chen, Magistrate Judge Taryn A. Merkl 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. (BBM) (Entered: 11/26/2025)
11/26/2025		ORDER: The Court will be issuing orders deciding the previously filed motions. No refiling of motions is necessary. Nor is any party permitted to call Chambers to inquire about the status of previously filed motions. The Court will be issuing further decisions and orders in due course. The litigation bar previously entered, 210 , remains in place. Furthermore, no new motions, letters, or other requests may be filed by any party until further Court management orders are issued next week. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 11/26/2025. (RB) (Entered: 11/26/2025)
12/03/2025		ORDER: The Court issues the following case management order. The Court will decide all currently pending motions, including those recently reinstated, in due course. Neither party may make any additional filings on this docket until the Court decides the pending matters. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 12/3/2025. (RB) (Entered: 12/03/2025)
12/05/2025		ORDER: Pro se Plaintiff Orrego's motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") 218 is denied for the reasons set forth in the Court's October 1, 2025 Order in this case, and the Court's June 10, 2025 Order in a related case initiated by Orrego. (*See also Orrego v. Kerrigan*, No. 25-CV-0736 (E.D.N.Y. June 10, 2025), Dkt. No. 11 (denying IFP and listing all of Orrego's prior IFP applications, all of which have been denied)). Orrego again seeks IFP status to appeal the filing injunction in this case, which is substantially similar to the subject of the request the Court denied on October 1, 2025. The Court has reviewed the record and certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith and IFP status is denied for the purposes of such an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). 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. Other motions remain pending, and the filing pause set by the Court's December 3, 2025 case management order remains in place. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 12/5/2025. (RB) (Entered: 12/05/2025)
12/10/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 212 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal, 219 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. (GO) (Entered: 12/10/2025)
12/22/2025	233	Letter request (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/22/2025	234	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/22/2025	235	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)

12/23/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 234 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: 12/23/2025)
12/29/2025	236	USCA NOTICE re 235 MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis. An appeal in the above-referenced case has been docketed in the Court of Appeals. According to the district court docket sheet or other available information, appellant has moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in the district court on December 22, 2025, and that motion is pending. The appeal may not move forward until the motion is determined. Please direct the motion to the appropriate judge for determination. Upon the grant or denial of the motion, please enter the order and transmit it to the Court of Appeals. 12/29/2025. USCA# 25-3217. (VJ) (Entered: 12/29/2025)
12/30/2025		ORDER: Pro se Plaintiff Orrego's motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") 235 is denied for the reasons set forth in the Court's December 5, 2025 Order. The Court has reviewed the record and certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith and IFP status is denied for the purposes of such an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962). 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. Other motions remain pending, and the filing pause set by the Courts December 3, 2025 case management order remains in place. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 12/30/2025. (RB) (Entered: 12/30/2025)
01/02/2026		Supplemental Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 234 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. (LF) (Entered: 01/02/2026)
03/18/2026	237	MANDATE of USCA 25-1802 as to 234 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego. Petitioner, pro se, has filed petitions for a writ of mandamus and moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in these consolidated petitions. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis are GRANTED for the purpose of filingthe mandamus petitions. It is further ORDERED that the mandamus petitions are DENIED because Petitioner has not demonstrated that she lacks an adequate, alternative means of obtaining relief, that her right to the writ is clear and indisputable, and that granting the writ is appropriate under the circumstances. See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367, 38081 (2004). (KS) (Entered: 03/18/2026)
03/24/2026		ORDER: Plaintiff Orrego's July 8, 2025 motion, 203 , is denied, for the reasons discussed in the Court's July 8, 2025 Order. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 3/24/2026. (RB) (Entered: 03/24/2026)
03/31/2026	238	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # 1 letter) (KS) (Entered: 04/06/2026)
03/31/2026	239	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion to Disqualify Judge, Order on Motion to Vacate by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 04/06/2026)
04/06/2026		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 239 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: 04/06/2026)
04/08/2026	240	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL (Corrected Version - Wet Signature) as to Order on Motion to Disqualify Judge, Order on Motion to Vacate by Lidia M. Orrego. (GO) (Entered: 04/08/2026)

04/08/2026		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 240 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. (GO) (Entered: 04/08/2026)
04/09/2026	241	NOTICE re 238 MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis. An appeal in the above-referenced case has been docketed in the Court of Appeals. According to the district court docket sheet or other available information, appellant has moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in the district court on March 31, 2026, and that motion is pending. The appeal may not move forward until the motion is determined. Please direct the motion to the appropriate judge for determination. Upon the grant or denial of the motion, please enter the order and transmit it to the Court of Appeals. 4/9/2026. USCA# 26-899. (VJ) (Entered: 04/09/2026)
05/05/2026	242	Letter *to Judge Bulsara regarding Plaintiff's conduct* by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Summons and Complaint, # 2 Exhibit B - Screenshot of Facebook Post) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 05/05/2026)
05/06/2026	243	MANDATE of USCA as to 240 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego, 239 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal filed by Lidia M. Orrego. This Court has determined sua sponte that it lacks jurisdiction over these appeals (consolidatedand in tandem) because a final order has not been issued by the district court as contemplated by28 U.S.C. § 1291. See Petrello v. White, 533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the appeals are DISMISSED in 25-2225 (L), 25-2434 (Con), 25-3217 (Con), 25-2239 (L), 25-2437 (Con), and 25-3208 (Con). It is further ORDERED that Appellants motions in both consolidated appeals are DENIED as moot.To the extent we construe the Appellants motion as a petition for mandamus, it is DENIED. SeeHong Mai Sa v. Doe, 406 F.3d 155, 158 (2d Cir. 2005). (KS) (Entered: 05/06/2026)
05/08/2026	244	ORDER: As explained in the attached, Defendants' motion for summary judgment, 221 , is granted, and Orrego's motion for summary judgment, 226 , is denied. Orrego's pending motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, 238 , is denied for the reasons set forth in the Court's December 5, 2025 Order, and the pending premotion conference request, 232 , is denied as moot. The Court also institutes a filing injunction against Orrego. The Clerk of Court is directed to open a miscellaneous case entitled "In re Orrego," and to file a copy of this Order under that docket number. The matter is then to be administratively closed. Any future filings by Orrego, including any motion for reconsideration, shall be filed under that miscellaneous docket number. The Court will review each filing. If the filing is found to be frivolous, no further action will be taken. If the filing states a claim that is not frivolous or does not fail to state a claim, the Court will direct the Clerk of Court to open a new civil matter in which the filing will be docketed, and the matter will proceed as a new case in the ordinary course. The present filing injunction is lifted solely for the purpose of filing any notice of appeal. Aside from filings related to her appeal, Orrego is enjoined from further filings in this case, and from initiating future actions in the Eastern District of New York absent a Court order. The Clerk of Court is directed to distribute this memorandum and order to all Clerk's Office personnel as appropriate. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 5/8/2026. (RB) (Entered: 05/08/2026)

05/08/2026	245	JUDGMENT: It is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego take nothing of Defendants Kevin Knipfing, Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIC LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steven Savitsky and Teresa A. Zantura; that Defendants motion for summary judgment is granted; that Plaintiffs motion for summary judgment is denied; that Plaintiffs motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis is denied; that the Court lifts the permanent filing injunction on Plaintiff Orrego solely for the purpose of filing any notice of appeal; that Orrego is enjoined from further filings in this case and initiating future actions in the Eastern District of New York absent a Court order; and that this case is closed. Ordered by Clerk of Court on 5/8/2026. (JC) (Entered: 05/08/2026)
06/01/2026	246	NOTICE OF APPEAL as to 245 Judgment,,, 244 Order on Motion for Summary Judgment,,,,,,,,,,,,,, Order on Motion for Pre Motion Conference,,,,,,, Order on Motion for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis,,,,,, by Lidia M. Orrego. Filing fee $ 605. (DC) (Main Document 246 replaced on 6/8/2026) (DC). (Entered: 06/05/2026)
06/01/2026		APPEAL FILING FEE DUE re 246 Notice of Appeal, Payment in the amount of $605.00, can be made in person to the clerks office, or mailed in or paid online with the event *Civil Case Appeal Filing Fee*. (DC) (Entered: 06/05/2026)
06/05/2026		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 246 Notice of 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. (DC) (Entered: 06/05/2026)
09/10/2026	247	NOTICE Petition for Writ of MANDAMUS, SERVED. (KS) (Entered: 09/11/2026)

PACER Service Center

Transaction Receipt

10/29/2026 18:32:54

PACER Login:	lidiaorrego	**Client Code:**	
Description:	Docket Report	**Search Criteria:**	2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Billable Pages:	30	**Cost:**	3.00