

FILED
CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Eastern District of New York

2026 APR -6 PM 8:32

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT
OF NEW YORK

NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Corrected Version – Wet Signature)

Re: DE 239

Lidia M. Orrego

Plaintiff(s),

-against-

Kevin Knipfing et al.

Defendant(s).

20-cv-3361 (SJB) (AYS)


Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego


(name all parties taking the appeal)* appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the order denying Plaintiff's motion to disqualify/recuse and from all related purported rulings or acts entered without jurisdiction (describe the order) entered

March 24, 2026 (state the date that the order was entered). This appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 3 and 4(a)(1)(A). Plaintiff respectfully states that this appeal is based on the collateral order doctrine as established in Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp. In the alternative, this filing should be construed as a petition for writ of mandamus under FRAP 21.

Plaintiff includes an attached Jurisdictional Statement and Supporting Grounds (Attachment A).

EXHIBITS: Plaintiff submits the following exhibits: Ex. 1 – 03-26-2026 Email, Order on Motion to Disqualify Ex. 2 – 07-08-2025 Email, Motion to Disqualify, Ex. 3 – 07-08-2025 Email, Order Ex. 4 – 07-08-2025 Email, Order on Motion to Stay, Ex. 5 – Docket Report (07-01-2025 to 03-30-2026)



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

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

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

ATTACHMENT A

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT AND SUPPORTING GROUND

The Order denying recusal qualifies for immediate appellate review under the collateral order doctrine because it conclusively determines the disputed question of judicial disqualification, resolves an issue separate from the merits, and involves rights that would be effectively unreviewable after final judgment, particularly where continued proceedings before a disqualified judge cause irreparable harm. See *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*; *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*

In the alternative, appellate jurisdiction is proper because the issues presented involve structural defects and lack of jurisdiction, rendering subsequent orders void. If direct appellate jurisdiction is deemed unavailable, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this filing be treated as a petition for writ of mandamus pursuant to FRAP 21, as mandamus is appropriate to review judicial disqualification and jurisdictional defects where no adequate remedy exists.

Plaintiff filed the motion to disqualify/recuse on July 8, 2025 at 4:25 PM. Within approximately three hours, the Court issued unrelated procedural orders at 7:21 PM and 7:26 PM, without addressing the recusal motion or its grounds.

The Court delayed ruling for over eight months, ultimately denying the motion on March 24, 2026, relying on those same unrelated orders rather than addressing the substantive requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 455. The Order's reliance on rulings issued within hours of the recusal motion—without first resolving the question of disqualification—renders the decision procedurally improper and inconsistent with the governing recusal standard.

The March 24, 2026 Order continues the same pattern of deprivation of rights and obstruction of justice that was the subject of Plaintiff's prior interlocutory appeal from the September 16, 2025 unlawful filing injunction (DE [219]) and is the subject of the criminal complaint filed with U.S. Attorney Joseph Nocella, Jr. on March 14, 2026 (resubmitted March 26–27, 2026) for docket alterations, concealment of records, obstruction of justice, and related violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1506, 2071, 2, 1512, and 1001.

The Court subsequently entered a recusal order on November 5 and 17, 2025, thereby divesting itself of jurisdiction. Any subsequent substantive actions—absent lawful reassignment—constitute purported rulings or acts entered without jurisdiction, and are void and of no legal effect.

EXHIBIT 1



Lidia Orrego <liorrego@gmail.com>

Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Orrego v. Knipfing et al Order on Motion to Disqualify Judge

1 message

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

Tue, Mar 24, 2026 at 2:04 PM

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

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

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 3/24/2026 at 2:04 PM EDT and filed on 3/24/2026

Case Name: Orrego v. Knipfing et al
Case Number: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Filer:
Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

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)

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Kuuku Angate Minnah-Donkoh kminnahdonkoh@grsm.com, evelez@grsm.com, vls_nysupport@grsm.com

Brian P. McLaughlin bmclaughlin@nassaucountyny.gov

Alex Dumas adumas@grsm.com, dlivera@grsm.com

Edward E. Warnke ewarnke@mizrahikroub.com

Lidia M. Orrego liorrego@gmail.com

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

EXHIBIT 2



Lidia Orrego <liorrego@gmail.com>

Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Orrego v. Knipfing et al Motion to Disqualify Judge

1 message

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

Tue, Jul 8, 2025 at 4:25 PM

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

Additional Security Enhancements Coming Soon For information visit PACER website

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

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

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 7/8/2025 at 4:25 PM EDT and filed on 7/8/2025

Case Name: Orrego v. Knipfing et al
Case Number: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Filer: Lidia M. Orrego
Document Number: 203

Docket Text:

Notice of MOTION to Disqualify Judge /Recuse, Notice of MOTION to Vacate July 2, 2025 Order by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF)

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Kuuku Angate Minnah-Donkoh kminnahdonkoh@grsm.com, evelez@grsm.com, vls_nysupport@grsm.com

Brian P. McLaughlin bmclaughlin@nassaucountyny.gov

Alex Dumas adumas@grsm.com, dlrivera@grsm.com

Edward E. Warnke ewarnke@mizrahikroub.com

Lidia M. Orrego liorrego@gmail.com

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description: Main Document
Original filename: n/a
Electronic document Stamp:

EXHIBIT 3



Lidia Orrego <liorrego@gmail.com>

Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Orrego v. Knipfing et al Order

1 message

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

Tue, Jul 8, 2025 at 7:21 PM

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

Additional Security Enhancements Coming Soon For information visit PACER website

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

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

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 7/8/2025 at 7:21 PM EDT and filed on 7/8/2025

Case Name: Orrego v. Knipfing et al
Case Number: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Filer:
Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

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)

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Kuuku Angate Minnah-Donkoh kminnahdonkoh@grsm.com, evelez@grsm.com, vls_nysupport@grsm.com

Brian P. McLaughlin bmclaughlin@nassaucountyny.gov

Alex Dumas adumas@grsm.com, ddrivera@grsm.com

Edward E. Warnke ewarnke@mizrahikroub.com

Lidia M. Orrego liorrego@gmail.com

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

EXHIBIT 4



Lidia Orrego <liorrego@gmail.com>

Activity in Case 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Orrego v. Knipfing et al Order on Motion to Stay

1 message

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

Tue, Jul 8, 2025 at 7:26 PM

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

Additional Security Enhancements Coming Soon For information visit PACER website

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

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

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 7/8/2025 at 7:26 PM EDT and filed on 7/8/2025

Case Name: Orrego v. Knipfing et al
Case Number: 2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Filer:
Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text:

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)

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Kuuku Angate Minnah-Donkoh kminnahdonkoh@grsm.com, evelez@grsm.com, vls_nysupport@grsm.com

Brian P. McLaughlin bmclaughlin@nassaucountyny.gov

Alex Dumas adumas@grsm.com, dlivera@grsm.com

Edward E. Warnke ewarnke@mizrahikroub.com

Lidia M. Orrego liorrego@gmail.com

2:20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS Notice will not be electronically mailed to:

EXHIBIT 5

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

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: [2:25-cv-00769-SJB-AYS](#)
[2:25-cv-00736-SJB-AYS](#)
[2:23-cv-06507-SJB-AYS](#)
[2:24-cv-07247-SJB-AYS](#)
Cause: 42:2000e Job Discrimination (Employment)

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

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
07/01/2025	200	Letter MOTION for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply / <i>Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule</i> 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 / <i>Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule</i> 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 / <i>Letter Motion For Adjournment of Summary Judgment Deadline, Status Update, Leave to File Amended Documents or Supplemental Certifications, and Briefing Schedule</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 07/08/2025)
07/08/2025	203	Notice of MOTION to Disqualify Judge / <i>Recuse</i> , Notice of MOTION to Vacate <i>July 2, 2025 Order</i> 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. <i>See</i> 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, <i>e.g.</i> , motions to disqualify opposing counsel, motions to stay, motions to vacate prior orders, and a motion to disqualify Judge Shields <u>190</u> , <u>194</u> , <u>196</u> , <u>197</u> , <u>198</u> , <u>200</u> . 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. <i>See Trivedi v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 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 <i>Sassower v. Sansverie</i> , 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, <i>see</i> Local Civil Rule 6.3, the motions at Docket Nos. <u>190</u> , <u>194</u> , <u>196</u> , <u>197</u> , <u>198</u> , <u>200</u> 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	<u>204</u>	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 <u>204</u> . 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	<u>206</u>	NOTICE from Lidia Orrego RE: Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Motion for Permission to Appeal In Forma Pauperis, and Certificate of Service, submitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on 7/16/2025. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2, # <u>2</u> Part 3, # <u>3</u> Part 4) (NF) (Entered: 07/23/2025)
07/23/2025	<u>205</u>	Letter MOTION to Vacate <i>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</i> 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 <u>205</u> is denied. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 7/24/2025. (MPG) (Entered: 07/24/2025)
08/05/2025	<u>207</u>	Emergency MOTION to Vacate <i>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</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (NF) (Entered: 08/05/2025)
08/08/2025	<u>208</u>	Letter <i>regarding service of Defendants' motion for summary judgment on Plaintiff</i> by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 08/08/2025)
08/11/2025	<u>209</u>	NOTICE of Filing of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 08/11/2025)
08/14/2025	<u>210</u>	ORDER: The motion <u>207</u> 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	<u>211</u>	MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>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</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 09/11/2025)
09/11/2025	<u>212</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to <u>210</u> Order on Motion to Vacate, by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/11/2025	<u>213</u>	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. <u>212</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (KS) (Entered: 09/15/2025)
09/16/2025	<u>214</u>	ORDER: On September 11, 2025, Lidia Orrego, acting pro se, filed a Notice of Interlocutory Appeal <u>212</u> of this Court's August 14, 2025 Order <u>210</u> together with an application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> ("IFP") <u>213</u> . However, Orrego used the form

		application for IFP status in the district court rather than Form 4 of the Appellate Appendix of Forms. Upon review, it is apparent that the present application lacks the information required by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(1). Accordingly, the application to proceed IFP <u>213</u> is denied without prejudice and with leave to renew on the Circuit Court's Form 4 annexed to this Order. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 9/16/2025. (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. <u>211</u> , are denied. Plaintiff is prohibited from making any further filings on this docket, or using the portal available to pro se litigants, absent further order of this Court (no leave may be sought). The Clerk's Office is directed to terminate Plaintiff Orrego's access to the pro se portal, to reject and promptly return to Plaintiff any motion or document submitted by her, and not to file any submission on ECF or retain custody of such material. Plaintiff is reminded that her filing of this unnecessary material has simply impeded, delayed, and obstructed the Court's ability to resolve the merits of the case, and its ability to move this case forward, to trial (if appropriate). The Court will lift this filing injunction following resolution of the pending motions in all of her cases, in order to give her an opportunity to object, appeal, or reconsider any decision, or to make any post-decision filings attendant to trial, should the Court determine that the case should proceed to trial or further discovery. But until the Court renders such decisions, the filing injunction imposed by this order will remain in place. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 9/16/2025. (RB) (Entered: 09/16/2025)
09/18/2025	<u>215</u>	Letter from Pro Se Department to Lidia M. Orrego dated 9/18/2025. The enclosed documents are being returned without docketing or consideration for the following reason(s): Pursuant to the enclosed electronic orders So Ordered by District Judge Bulsara on 9/16/2025 "The Clerk's Office is directed to return all of this material via first-class mail to Plaintiff." (NF) (Entered: 09/18/2025)
09/19/2025	<u>216</u>	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. <u>212</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal. Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (LF) (Entered: 09/22/2025)
09/23/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>212</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (KS) (Entered: 09/23/2025)
09/30/2025	<u>217</u>	Letter MOTION for Leave to Appeal <i>order of the court entered on September 16, 2025</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
09/30/2025	<u>218</u>	MOTION for Leave to Appeal in forma pauperis by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)

09/30/2025	<u>219</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion for Leave to File, entered on 9/16/2025, by Lidia M. Orrego. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
10/01/2025		ORDER: Pro se Plaintiff Orrego's motion for leave to appeal <i>in forma pauperis</i> <u>216</u> is denied. "An appeal may not be taken <i>in forma pauperis</i> if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." <i>Romero v. DHL Express, Inc.</i>, No. 15-CV-4844, 2017 WL 2266990, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 6, 2017) (internal quotations and citations omitted). The "good faith" standard is objective; and it is not met when a party seeks review of a frivolous claim. <i>See Coppedge v. United States</i>, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Here, Orrego seeks to appeal this Court's entry of a filing injunction. As this Court has repeatedly explained, the filing injunction—imposed after notice was provided—was an appropriate sanction given Orrego's repetitive filing of unnecessary material that has impeded, delayed, and obstructed the Court's ability to resolve the merits of the case. (<i>See</i> 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. (<i>See</i> Order dated Sep. 16, 2025). A frivolous appeal of the injunction only works to further delay the resolution of these cases. The Court has reviewed the record and certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith. <i>See Coppedge</i>, 369 U.S. at 444-45. The application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> is denied. Pursuant to Rule 24(a)(4) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, the Clerk of Court shall immediately notify the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit of this Order. The Clerk of Court is also respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to Orrego at her address of record and to record such service on the docket. So Ordered by Judge Sanket J. Bulsara on 10/1/2025. (RB) (Entered: 10/01/2025)
10/01/2025	<u>220</u>	NEF received from Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (USCA #25-2399) re Petition for Writ Served. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Part 2) (LF) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
10/02/2025		Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. <u>219</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (DC) (Entered: 10/02/2025)
10/03/2025	<u>221</u>	MOTION for Summary Judgment by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Rule 56.1 Statement, # <u>2</u> Declaration, # <u>3</u> Exhibit A - Plaintiff's Deposition, # <u>4</u> Exhibit B - Savitsky WCB Testimony, # <u>5</u> Exhibit C - Old Westbury Eddie, LLC, record of Incorporation, # <u>6</u> Exhibit D - Test Msgs, # <u>7</u> Exhibit E - Job Offer Letter, # <u>8</u> Exhibit F - Non-Disclosure Agreement, # <u>9</u> Exhibit G - Plaintiff's WC Application, # <u>10</u> Exhibit H - Plaintiff's Text Msgs, # <u>11</u> Exhibit I - Email Report 4, # <u>12</u> Exhibit J - Plaintiff's diary, # <u>13</u> Exhibit K - Plaintiff's Pavillion Agency Resume, # <u>14</u> Exhibit L - Plaintiff's March 5, 2021 WCB Hearing Testimony, # <u>15</u> Exhibit M - Text Msgs, # <u>16</u> Exhibit N - Plaintiff's October 26, 2018 Wage Statement, # <u>17</u> Exhibit O - November 2, 2018 Complaint, # <u>18</u> Exhibit P - Email Report 1, # <u>19</u> Exhibit Q - Email Report 2, # <u>20</u> Exhibit R - Email Report 3, # <u>21</u> Exhibit S - Email Report 5, # <u>22</u> Exhibit T - Email Report 6, # <u>23</u> Exhibit U - Email Report 7, # <u>24</u> Exhibit V - Email from Testa to Plaintiff re Investigation, # <u>25</u> Exhibit W - Email from Kevin Flannagan, # <u>26</u> Exhibit X - Termination Letter, # <u>27</u> Exhibit Y - Image of E-Folder Containing Photographs, # <u>28</u> Exhibit Z - Image of E-Folder Containing Videos, # <u>29</u> Exhibit AA - September 30, 2021 MTD Decision, # <u>30</u> Exhibit BB - March 10 2021 WCB Decision, # <u>31</u> Exhibit CC - June 21, 2021 WCB Board Panel Decision, # <u>32</u> Exhibit DD - November 2, 2023 Third Department Decision, # <u>33</u> Exhibit EE - Plaintiff's June 2021 Inspector General Complaint, # <u>34</u> Exhibit FF - Plaintiff's June 2021 NYSDOH Complaint, # <u>35</u> Exhibit GG - Plaintiff's July 2021 NYSCJC Complaint,

		# <u>36</u> Exhibit HH 0 Plaintiff's February 2023 State Court Complaint, # <u>37</u> Exhibit II - Transcript of February 2025 Proceeding, # <u>38</u> Exhibit JJ - April 2025 Decision, # <u>39</u> Exhibit KK - April 2025 Dismissal, # <u>40</u> Exhibit LL - Plaintiff's July 2024 State Court Complaint, # <u>41</u> Exhibit MM - June 2020 NCDSS Notice Ltrs, # <u>42</u> Exhibit NN - July 2020 NYS OCFS ltrs, # <u>43</u> Exhibit OO - Plaintiff's December 2020 Complaint against Debra Karpfntiff's March 2024 Ltr to NCDSS, # <u>44</u> Exhibit PP- Plaintiff's March 2024 Ltr to NCDSS, # <u>45</u> Exhibit QQ - Plaintiff's December 2024 Nassau County Article 78 Petition, # <u>46</u> Exhibit RR - April 2025 Nassau County Supreme Court Decision, # <u>47</u> Exhibit SS - Plaintiff's March 2021 Queens County Supreme Court Complaint, # <u>48</u> Exhibit TT - July 2025 Second Department Decision, # <u>49</u> Exhibit UU - March 2021 NYSDHR Determination and Order of Dismissal of Administrative Convenience, # <u>50</u> Exhibit VV - Plaintiff's August 2021 Queens County Supreme Court Complaint against Ley Family, # <u>51</u> Exhibit WW - Plaintiff's June 2020 Letter to the Derek Smith Law Group, # <u>52</u> Exhibit XX - Plaintiff's June 2020 Letter to Borrelli & Associates, # <u>53</u> Exhibit YY - Plaintiff's April 2020 Letter to Law Office of Peter A. Romero, # <u>54</u> Memorandum in Support, # <u>55</u> Exhibit Notice to Pro Se Litigation Who Opposed a Motion for Summary Judgment) (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/03/2025)
10/03/2025	<u>222</u>	REPLY in Support re <u>221</u> 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	<u>223</u>	Letter MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>Motion for Summary Judgment</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 10/03/2025)
10/03/2025	<u>224</u>	AFFIRMATION of Lidia M. Orrego in Opposition re <u>221</u> Defendants' MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Affidavit in Support of Authentication of Evidence and Certifications Government Agencies, # <u>2</u> Plaintiff's Counterstatement of Material Facts Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 56.1 in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>3</u> Memorandum of Law in Opposition Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>4</u> Exhibit 1, # <u>5</u> Exhibit 2, # <u>6</u> Exhibit 3, # <u>7</u> Exhibit 4, # <u>8</u> Exhibit 5, # <u>9</u> Exhibit 6, # <u>10</u> Exhibit 7, # <u>11</u> Exhibit 8, # <u>12</u> Exhibit 9, # <u>13</u> Exhibit 10, # <u>14</u> Exhibit 11, # <u>15</u> Exhibit 12, # <u>16</u> Exhibit 13, # <u>17</u> Exhibit 14, # <u>18</u> Exhibit 15, # <u>19</u> Exhibit 16, # <u>20</u> Exhibit 17, # <u>21</u> Exhibit 18, # <u>22</u> Exhibit 19, # <u>23</u> Exhibit 20, # <u>24</u> Exhibit 21, # <u>25</u> Exhibit 22, # <u>26</u> Exhibit 24, # <u>27</u> Exhibit 25, # <u>28</u> Exhibit 26, # <u>29</u> Exhibit 27, # <u>30</u> Exhibit 28, # <u>31</u> Exhibit 29, # <u>32</u> Exhibit 30, # <u>33</u> Exhibit 31, # <u>34</u> Exhibit 32, # <u>35</u> Exhibit 33, # <u>36</u> Exhibit 34, # <u>37</u> Exhibit 35, # <u>38</u> Exhibit 36, # <u>39</u> Exhibit 37, # <u>40</u> Exhibit 38, # <u>41</u> Exhibit 39, # <u>42</u> Exhibit 40, # <u>43</u> Exhibit 41, # <u>44</u> 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 <u>223</u> is denied as moot. Orrego's summary judgment motion is not subject to the Court's August 14, 2025 filing injunction <u>210</u> , 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	<u>225</u>	Letter <i>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</i> by Stephanieanna James-Knipfing, Kevin Knipfing, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Teresa A. Zantua (Minnah-Donkoh, Kuuku) (Entered: 10/06/2025)
10/06/2025	<u>226</u>	Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>2</u> Affirmation of Lidia M.Orrego in Support of Local Rule 56.1 Statement and Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>3</u> Plaintiff's Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, # <u>4</u> Memorandum of Law in Support

		of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>5</u> List Exhibits Summary Judgment, # <u>6</u> Exhibit 1, # <u>7</u> Exhibit 2, # <u>8</u> Exhibit 3, # <u>9</u> Exhibit 4, # <u>10</u> Exhibit 5, # <u>11</u> Exhibit 6, # <u>12</u> Exhibit 7, # <u>13</u> Exhibit 8, # <u>14</u> Exhibit 9, # <u>15</u> Exhibit 10, # <u>16</u> Exhibit 11, # <u>17</u> Exhibit 12, # <u>18</u> Exhibit 13, # <u>19</u> Exhibit 14, # <u>20</u> Exhibit 15, # <u>21</u> Exhibit 16, # <u>22</u> Exhibit 17, # <u>23</u> Exhibit 18, # <u>24</u> Exhibit 19, # <u>25</u> Exhibit 20, # <u>26</u> Exhibit 21, # <u>27</u> Exhibit 22, # <u>28</u> Exhibit 23, # <u>29</u> Exhibit 24, # <u>30</u> Exhibit 25, # <u>31</u> Exhibit 26) (NF) (Entered: 10/07/2025)
10/06/2025	<u>227</u>	DECLARATION OF Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh in Opposition re Plaintiff's <u>226</u> Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Declaration of Kuuku Minnah-Donkoh in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>2</u> Defendant's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>3</u> Defendant's Responses to Plaintiff's Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts, # <u>4</u> Exhibit ZZ) (NF) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/06/2025	<u>228</u>	REPLY in Support re <u>226</u> Notice of MOTION for Summary Judgment filed by Lidia M. Orrego. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Plaintiff's Affirmation of Authentication of Exhibits 26-47, # <u>2</u> Plaintiff's Reply Defendants' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Fated September 12, 2025, # <u>3</u> Plaintiff's Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, # <u>4</u> Exhibit 26, # <u>5</u> Exhibit 27, # <u>6</u> Exhibit 28, # <u>7</u> Exhibit 29, # <u>8</u> Exhibit 30, # <u>9</u> Exhibit 31, # <u>10</u> Exhibit 32, # <u>11</u> Exhibit 33, # <u>12</u> Exhibit 34, # <u>13</u> Exhibit 35, # <u>14</u> Exhibit 36, # <u>15</u> Exhibit 37, # <u>16</u> Exhibit 38, # <u>17</u> Exhibit 39, # <u>18</u> Exhibit 40, # <u>19</u> Exhibit 41, # <u>20</u> Exhibit 42, # <u>21</u> Exhibit 43, # <u>22</u> Exhibit 44, # <u>23</u> Exhibit 45, # <u>24</u> Exhibit 46, # <u>25</u> Exhibit 47) (NF) (Entered: 10/08/2025)
10/06/2025	<u>229</u>	NOTICE: The Clerks Office received the attached USB in support of <u>226</u> , <u>227</u> and <u>228</u> ; 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 <u>226</u> , <u>227</u> and <u>228</u> . 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	<u>230</u>	MOTION for Leave to File Document <i>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.</i> by Lidia M. Orrego. (NF) (Entered: 10/21/2025)
10/21/2025	<u>231</u>	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 <u>230</u> 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, <u>203</u> , <u>217</u> , <u>218</u> , <u>221</u> , and <u>226</u> , 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	<u>232</u>	Letter MOTION for pre motion conference (<i>Urgent Request</i>) To Vacate Unlawful Pre-Filing Injunctions and to Restore Constitutional and Statutory 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, <u>210</u> , 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 <i>in forma pauperis</i> ("IFP") <u>218</u> 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. (<i>See also Orrego v. Kerrigan</i> , 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. <i>See Coppedge v. United States</i> , 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. <u>212</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal, <u>219</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (GO) (Entered: 12/10/2025)
12/22/2025	<u>233</u>	Letter request (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/22/2025	<u>234</u>	NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL by Lidia M. Orrego. (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)

12/22/2025	<u>235</u>	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. <u>234</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (KS) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/29/2025	<u>236</u>	USCA NOTICE re <u>235</u> 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 <i>in forma pauperis</i> ("IFP") <u>235</u> 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. <i>See Coppedge v. United States</i> , 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. <u>234</u> Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (LF) (Entered: 01/02/2026)
03/18/2026	<u>237</u>	MANDATE of USCA 25-1802 as to <u>234</u> 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 filing the 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 <i>Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.</i> , 542 U.S. 367, 38081 (2004). (KS) (Entered: 03/18/2026)
03/24/2026		ORDER: Plaintiff Orrego's July 8, 2025 motion, <u>203</u> , 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)

PACER Service Center
Transaction Receipt
03/30/2026 19:28:01

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Kevin Knipfing a/k/a Kevin James, Stephanieanna
James-Knipfing a/k/a Steffiana de la Cruz, Old
Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC,
Steve Savitsky, Teresa A. Zantua.
Defendants.

Affirmation of Service

2:20-cv-3361 (SJB) (AYS)

I, Lidia M. Orrego, declare under penalty of perjury that I served a copy of the Corrected Notice of Appeal (with wet signature), Letter Motion for Leave to File, Notice of Appeal of Order dated March 24, 2026, Jurisdictional Statement and Supporting Grounds (Attachment A), and Exhibits 1–5, upon the Defendant(s) or their attorney(s) at the following address:

Law Firm Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP
One Battery Park Plaza, 28th Floor
New York, NY 10004

Via ECF & Notice has been electronically mailed to: kminnahdonkoh@grsm.com;
kminnahdonkoh@gordonrees.com; dlivera@grsm.com; pcella@grsm.com

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

Dated: April 6, 2026
Rego Park, New York

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



**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE®**

FILED
CLERK

APR -6 PM 8:33
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT
OF NEW YORK

**PRIORITY®
MAIL**

FILED
CLERK

2026 APR -6 PM

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT
OF NEW YORK



MAILING ENVELOPE
FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL USE

To schedule free Package Pickup,
scan the QR code.



USPS.COM/PICKUP

Pro Se Office
United States District Court
Eastern District of New York

Central Islip Courthouse
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722

Re: Orrego v. Knipfing et al.
Case No. 20-cv-03361-SJB-AYS
Submission: Notice of Appeal Corrected,
DE [239] per Court of Appeals 2nd Circ.
Instructions.

From: Lidia M. Orrego

TRACKED ■ INSURED



PS00000133100

EP14 July 2022
OD: 15 x 11.625

VISIT US AT
ORDER FREE S