

STATE OF NEW YORK
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

In the Matter of the Proceeding
Pursuant to Section 44, subdivision 4,
of the Judiciary Law in Relation to

DETERMINATION

ROSEANNA H. WASHINGTON,

a Judge of the White Plains City Court,
Westchester County.

THE COMMISSION:

Henry T. Berger, Esq., Chair
*Honorable Frederick M. Marshall, Vice Chair
Honorable Frances A. Ciardullo
Stephen R. Coffey, Esq.
Lawrence S. Goldman, Esq.
Christina Hernandez, M.S.W.
Honorable Daniel F. Luciano
Mary Holt Moore
Honorable Karen K. Peters
Alan J. Pope, Esq.
Honorable Terry Jane Ruderman

APPEARANCES:

Gerald Stern (Alan W. Friedberg, Of Counsel) for the Commission

Honorable Roseanna H. Washington, *pro se*

*Judge Marshall died on September 10, 2002. The vote in this case was taken on June 20, 2002.

The respondent, Roseanna H. Washington, a Judge of the White Plains City Court, Westchester County, was served with a Formal Written Complaint dated April 16, 2001, containing two charges. Respondent filed an answer dated May 7, 2001.

By Order dated June 6, 2001, the Commission designated Honorable Janet A. Johnson as referee to hear and report proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. A hearing was held on September 28, 2001, in White Plains, New York, and the referee filed her report dated March 4, 2002, with the Commission.

The parties submitted briefs with respect to the referee's report. On June 20, 2002, the Commission heard oral argument, at which respondent appeared, and thereafter considered the record of the proceeding and made the following findings of fact.

1. Respondent, an attorney, has served as a part-time judge of the City Court of White Plains, Westchester County, since her appointment in January 1997.

2. The responsibility of the part-time judge in the White Plains City Court is to preside over small claims matters on alternate Wednesdays and to fill in for the full-time judge in the event the judge is unavailable.

3. Respondent presides over approximately 75 to 80 small claims cases each year.

With respect to Charge I of the Formal Written Complaint:

4. Respondent failed to render timely decisions in 67 small claims

matters, as set forth in the annexed Schedule 1. Of the 67 matters, 20 were pending for periods of six to twelve months; 19 were pending for periods of one year to 18 months; 12 were pending for periods of 18 months to two years; and nine were pending for periods of between two and two and a half years. Seven small claims cases that were tried between March 2000 and February 2001 were still pending as of September 28, 2001: Bernstein v. Ray Cohen Lexus (trial held October 11, 2000); Maggio v. Baldwin (trial held October 18, 2000); Mangeri v. Route World Brokers (trial held March 22, 2000); McDonald v. Div Dati Construction (trial held January 17, 2001); Quirk v. Sprague (trial held June 28, 2000); Weintraub v. Siegel (trial held February 7, 2001); and White Plains Drapery & Upholstery v. Anker Management (trial held April 5, 2000).

5. For the periods of January-March 1998, April-June 1998 and July-September 1998, respondent filed quarterly reports regarding undecided matters pending for more than 60 days, as required by Section 4.1 of the Rules of the Chief Judge, that stated, contrary to the facts, that there were no cases pending for more than 60 days. With respect to these reports, respondent testified that, on each occasion, she believed that she “would get to them, finish them up and, at that time, be, quote, ‘caught up.’”

6. On her quarterly report for January-March 1999, dated April 7, 1999, respondent listed nine cases as pending more than 60 days and wrote: “These matters will be decided on or before 7/21/99.” Of the nine matters, one was decided in August 1999, one in September 1999, one in October 1999, one in February 2000, one in May 2000, and four were decided in July 2000.

7. For the periods of April-June 1999, July-September 1999 and October-December 1999, respondent failed to file quarterly reports of cases pending more than 60 days until March 27, 2000, notwithstanding that respondent's Administrative Judge, Honorable Francis A. Nicolai, in letters dated July 22, 1999, October 25, 1999, January 24, 2000, and February 7, 2000, directed respondent to file the overdue reports as soon as possible.

8. On her quarterly report for April-June 2000, which was filed on July 10, 2000, respondent listed 19 delayed cases for "April-May 2000 quarter" and wrote that she "will clear all pending decision[s] by July 14, 2000." Of the 19 matters listed, one was decided in June 2000, seven in September 2000, seven in October 2000, one in November 2000, one in May 2001, and two were still pending as of September 28, 2001.

9. Respondent failed to report 38 cases pending for more than 60 days in the quarterly reports required by Section 4.1 of the Rules of the Chief Judge, as set forth in the annexed Schedule 2.

10. Judge Nicolai directed respondent on numerous occasions to issue timely decisions in the undecided small claims matters. Judge Nicolai wrote to respondent directing her to issue timely decisions on April 27, 1999, March 30, 2000, April 7, 2000, April 18, 2000, May 4, 2000, May 26, 2000 and September 14, 2000.

11. Early in 1999, Judge Nicolai and his principal law clerk, Tomme Berg, Esq., met with respondent to discuss the numerous undecided matters pending before respondent. At that meeting, Judge Nicolai directed respondent to render decisions

in the pending matters.

12. On April 18, 2000, after respondent reported 47 delayed matters on her quarterly report for January-March 2000, Judge Nicolai and Ms. Berg met again with respondent to discuss the numerous undecided matters pending before respondent. At that meeting, Judge Nicolai directed respondent to render decisions in the pending matters. Judge Nicolai and Ms. Berg also advised respondent on techniques to render more timely decisions. Respondent advised Judge Nicolai that she would issue decisions in five of the pending cases each week. Respondent failed to comply with that schedule. By May 19, 2000, respondent had issued decisions in six of the 47 delayed matters, and respondent did not render any additional decisions in the delayed matters until June 26, 2000, when she decided three matters.

13. Respondent knew that many of the litigants of the pending small claims matters had complained about the lack of timely decisions. Respondent had personally received complaints. Complaints were relayed to respondent from the clerk of the court; Judge Nicolai also advised respondent of complaints he had received.

14. The small claims matters awaiting decision by respondent did not involve unusual or complex issues, but rather presented typical small claims matters. The decisions rendered by respondent are generally less than two full pages, although two are four pages in length, and contain summaries of the evidence and a very brief discussion of any legal issues, often without citation to any legal authority.

15. Since early 2000, a court attorney has been assigned to respondent's

court. Although respondent could have assigned the court attorney to research decisions in the pending matters and believed that the court attorney would do so expeditiously if so assigned, respondent did not assign the matters to the court attorney.

16. Respondent testified that after her appointment as a judge, she attempted to change her law practice, which had been largely in criminal law in local courts, to a general civil practice, due to ethical restrictions prohibiting her from appearing before any part-time judge in Westchester County. Respondent testified that “as a result... much more time had to be taken than I anticipated. This meant that I was not available to spend more time in court.”

17. Respondent testified further that her practice in handling cases was to take extensive notes during the trial and reserve decisions, pending research of the legal issues, because she felt a responsibility to the litigants who were predominantly *pro se*. Respondent testified that as a consequence of this practice and the limited time she could devote to the court, the cases started “building up.”

With respect to Charge II of the Formal Written Complaint:

18. On October 6, 2000, respondent received a letter from the Commission, dated October 5, 2000, requesting her response to questions concerning her conduct.

19. On October 30, 2000, respondent received a follow-up letter from the Commission dated October 23, 2000, advising respondent that she had not responded

to the Commission's letter dated October 5, 2000, and requesting her response.

20. On November 28, 2000, respondent received a third letter from the Commission, dated November 9, 2000, advising respondent that she had not responded to the Commission's letter dated October 5, 2000, and requesting that she respond within five days of receipt of the letter.

21. Respondent testified before the Commission on December 15, 2000. At that time, respondent submitted a response to the Commission's letter of October 5, 2000. Prior to that time, respondent did not respond to the letter of October 5, 2000 or communicate with the Commission concerning her failure to respond to the letter, although respondent testified that she "was aware that once the Commission wrote me, that this was serious."

22. On March 5, 2001, respondent received a letter from the Commission, dated March 2, 2001, requesting her response to questions concerning her conduct and asking that she respond by March 13, 2001.

23. Respondent responded to the Commission's letter of March 2, 2001, on April 6, 2001, by letter received by facsimile transmission at the Commission's office. Prior to April 6, 2001, respondent did not respond to the Commission's letter or communicate with the Commission concerning her failure to respond to the letter.

24. Respondent testified that she did not consider requesting an extension of time to respond to the Commission's letter; rather, respondent tried to focus on getting all of the material together to respond to the Commission as soon as possible.

Upon the foregoing findings of fact, the Commission concludes as a matter of law that respondent violated Sections 100.1, 100.2(A), 100.3(B)(7) and 100.3(C)(1) of the Rules Governing Judicial Conduct. Charges I and II of the Formal Written Complaint are sustained insofar as they are consistent with the findings herein, and respondent's misconduct is established.

The record establishes that respondent failed to render timely decisions in numerous small claims matters, despite the active intervention and assistance of her administrative judge, and that she subverted the efforts of court administrators to monitor her delays. Respondent's failure to respond in a timely manner to the Commission's repeated inquiries concerning her conduct was consistent with a pattern of inattention to her responsibilities as a judge. By her actions, respondent has demonstrated that she is unable or unwilling to properly carry out the duties of a judge.

Despite a small caseload consisting of approximately 75 to 80 small claims matters per year, respondent began to develop a backlog of cases awaiting decision soon after her ascension to the bench. Respondent, a part-time judge who is permitted to practice law, explained at the hearing that her efforts to change her law practice required more time than she had anticipated, which "meant that I was not available to spend more time in court." Although the small claims matters she handled were relatively simple and, by respondent's own account, each decision "would take about an hour to an hour and a half," respondent failed to devote sufficient time to her judicial duties to enable her to

issue timely decisions on a consistent basis, resulting in a significant backlog and numerous complaints from litigants about the delays.

As stated in Section 100.3(A)(1) of the Rules Governing Judicial Conduct: “The judicial duties of a judge take precedence over all the judge’s other activities.” The ethical standards specifically require every judge to “dispose of all judicial matters promptly, efficiently and fairly” (Section 100.3[B][7] of the Rules).

Not even the active intervention of her administrative judge or his repeated, strongly-worded reminders induced respondent to dispose promptly of the delayed matters and to avoid delays on the new matters she handled. On numerous occasions respondent’s administrative judge directed her to dispose of the delayed matters and offered to provide assistance. In one letter, he advised respondent that her “lengthy delays are completely unacceptable” and “must receive your highest priority”; a month later, he wrote: “[T]his unacceptable situation must be resolved and must receive your highest priority”; the following month, he again advised respondent that the problem of delayed matters “must be remedied without delay.” Respondent’s administrative judge met with respondent to discuss the problem, advised respondent on techniques to render timely decisions and worked out a schedule for disposing promptly of the delayed matters.

Despite these notable efforts, the problem of delays continued, even after respondent was on notice of the Commission’s involvement in the matter. Significantly, of the eight delayed matters listed as still pending as of the date of the Formal Written

Complaint, respondent had rendered decisions in only three of the matters (Avgush, Daher and Post) by the date of the hearing five months later, at which point the five undecided matters had been pending for periods ranging from 11 to 18 months. (Two additional pending matters were cited in an amended Schedule 1.)

Respondent seriously compounded her misconduct by failing to file quarterly reports of undecided matters in a timely manner, as required by Section 4.1 of the Rules of the Chief Judge, and by filing reports that were false, misleading and incomplete. Three reports filed in 1998 falsely stated that respondent had no pending matters undecided for more than 60 days when, in fact, there were numerous such delayed matters, including one case tried in May 1997. Three quarterly reports for 1999 were not filed until March 27, 2000, despite repeated reminders from her administrative judge, and those reports omitted numerous matters that should have been reported. On two reports, respondent added a note stating that all the delayed matters would be decided within three months (Comm. Ex. 5) or within a few days (Comm. Ex. 10), but respondent failed to comply even with her self-imposed deadlines and decided only one matter within the time she had specified.

In Matter of Greenfield v. Commn on Jud Conduct, 76 NY2d 293, 298 (1990), the Court of Appeals held that a judge's delays in eight civil matters did not constitute misconduct and that such matters generally "can and should be resolved in the administrative setting." The Court further stated that disciplinary action:

...should only be appropriate and necessary when the judge has defied administrative directives or has attempted to subvert the system by, for instance, falsifying, concealing or persistently refusing to file records indicating delays.

* * *

[I]f the judge fails to comply with administrative orders, his conduct must necessarily be deemed an appropriate subject for disciplinary action.

Id.

The Court in Greenfield cited with approval the rule requiring the filing of quarterly reports of delayed cases, “which permits and requires court administrators to assess the reasons for the delay and take appropriate action” (*Id.* at 299).

In the present matter, respondent’s conduct falls squarely within the parameters of misconduct set forth in Greenfield in that she defied repeated administrative directives to promptly dispose of the delayed matters and, even after strenuous intervention and assistance by court administrators, filed reports of delayed matters that were untimely and incomplete. Indeed, one letter to respondent by the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge (in April 1999) and another letter by respondent’s administrative judge (in May 2000) specifically cited Greenfield and warned respondent of the possibility of sanctions if the delays continued; another letter admonished respondent: “This situation cannot be allowed to continue. It is unfair to the litigants and reflects adversely upon you and the judicial system.”

Respondent’s pattern of delay and inattention to her responsibilities as a

judge included her failure to respond in a timely manner to letters from the Commission, which was investigating her conduct. She failed to respond to the Commission's initial letter for more than two months, notwithstanding two follow-up letters that were sent, and she submitted a response to a subsequent inquiry three weeks after it was due.

As respondent has acknowledged: "The impression of the public on the court system is formed by the kind of contact made with the court. Small claims and commercial claims litigants come to the court expecting a resolution to their legal problems." Moreover, such litigants are generally unrepresented and are not knowledgeable as to what action to take when decisions are delayed for extended periods of time after trial. As the Court of Appeals has stated: "[L]itigants should not be expected to wait years for a decision because a judge wants to produce a scholarly writing; nor should they be required to commence collateral proceedings to compel the judge to render a decision." Matter of Greenfield, *supra*, 76 NY2d at 298.

In determining that the sanction of removal is appropriate, we are mindful that "the purpose of judicial disciplinary proceedings is 'not punishment but the imposition of sanctions where necessary to safeguard the Bench from unfit incumbents.'" Matter of Reeves v. Comm on Jud Conduct, 63 NY2d 105, 111 (1984), quoting Matter of Waltemade, 37 NY2d (a), (111) (Ct on the Jud 1975). Respondent's inability or unwillingness to perform her responsibilities as a judge with appropriate diligence demonstrates that she is unfit for judicial office.

By reason of the foregoing, the Commission determines that the appropriate sanction is removal from office.

Mr. Berger, Judge Ciardullo, Mr. Coffey, Mr. Goldman, Ms. Moore, Judge Luciano, Judge Peters and Judge Ruderman concur.

Ms. Hernandez, Judge Marshall and Mr. Pope were not present.

CERTIFICATION

It is certified that the foregoing is the determination of the State Commission on Judicial Conduct.

Dated: October 1, 2002



Henry T. Berger, Esq., Chair
New York State
Commission on Judicial Conduct

SCHEDULE 1

	<u>Case</u>	<u>Date of Trial</u>	<u>Date of Decision</u>	<u>How Long Pending</u>
1	Accurso v. Merl	10/20/99	10/12/00	11 months, 22 days
2	Alcena v. Whittle	07/28/99	01/26/00	5 months, 29 days
3	Avgush v. Friedman	08/21/00	07/26/01	11 months, 5 days
4	Barbalaco v. Siino	03/12/97	09/05/97	5 months, 24 days
5	Beck v. Abrahams	08/26/98	04/14/99	7 months, 19 days
6	Bernstein v. Ray Cohen Lexus	10/11/00		Pending as of 09/28/01
7	Campbell v. Con Edison	05/27/98	10/12/99	1 year, 4 months, 15 days
8	Campos-Irizarry v. Williams	03/03/99	10/12/00	1 year, 7 months, 9 days
9	Christenson (Empire State Builders) v. Shaffer	06/09/99	05/03/00	10 months, 24 days
10	Ciervo v. Carbone and Acciai Specialli Terni USA, Inc.	07/09/98	07/07/00	1 year, 11 months, 28 days
11	Clemente v. Basler	12/03/97	07/24/98	7 months, 21 days
12	Corner Closet, Inc. v. Fabric Concepts (Goldberg v. Burke Fabric)	04/08/98	05/19/00	2 years, 1 month 11 days
13	Daher v. Gouveia	03/15/00	05/02/01	1 year, 1 month, 17 days
14	Deutsch v. Lancelloti	10/20/99	10/12/00	11 months, 22 days
15	Dilip Kha v. Zellermayer	01/03/01	09/13/01	8 months, 10 days

16	Duffy and Kelly v. White Plains Dodge	08/19/98	07/05/00	1 year, 10 months, 16 days
17	Esposito and Gerena v. Peck	05/19/99	06/26/00	1 year, 7 days
18	Feinsod Hardware Co. v. Alfredo Landscaping & Consultants	04/21/99	07/07/00	1 year, 2 months, 16 days
19	Flamio v. Flamio	09/01/99	10/03/00	1 year, 1 month, 2 days
20	George v. Metro Toyota	01/06/99	07/07/00	1 year, 6 months, 1 day
21	Green v. Congregation Kol Ami JCC of White Plains	12/15/99	10/12/00	9 months, 27 days
22	Gross v. A. Palmeri Landscaping Co.	11/18/98	11/10/99	11 months, 23 days
23	Halpak Plastics, Inc. v. Bedemco Import-Export, Inc.	06/30/99	05/16/00	10 months, 16 days
24	Harris v. Burke Fuel & Heating Co., Inc	09/16/98	06/29/00	1 year, 9 months, 13 days
25	Harris v. Graubart	05/26/99	09/26/00	1 year, 4 months
26	Hunter v. Westchester Chrysler Plymouth	04/28/99	07/07/00	1 year, 2 months, 9 days
27	Johnson v. Meile	01/06/99	02/16/00	1 year, 1 month, 10 days
28	Kronick v. Soltzer	03/16/98 (Inquest)	04/26/00	2 years, 1 month, 10 days
29	Larmon v. Horne	06/17/98	07/05/00	2 years, 18 days
30	Lent v. The Bank of New York	01/07/98	07/05/00	2 years, 5 months, 28 days

31	Lester v. The Marcon Group, LTD	03/22/00	11/14/00	7 months, 23 days
32	Libsch v. Stephen Roger Rabin	06/30/99	09/26/00	1 year, 2 months, 27 days
33	Lyons v. Westchester Pavilion	09/16/98	02/23/00	1 year, 5 months, 7 days
34	Maggio v. Baldwin	10/18/00		Pending as of 09/28/01
35	Mangeri v. Route World Brokers, Inc.	03/22/00		Pending as of 09/28/01
36	Mark v. Capital Quest, LLC	10/20/99 (Motion)	09/26/00	11 months, 6 days
37	Masso v. Seigetvari	04/15/98	07/07/00	2 years, 2 months, 22 days
38	McDonald v. Div Dati Construction	01/17/01		Pending as of 09/28/01
39	McDonald v. Lousberg	06/11/97	09/28/99	2 years, 3 months, 17 days
40	Meyer v. Masback	02/11/98	08/13/99	1 year, 6 months, 2 days
41	Monteleone v. Arone	09/22/99	09/26/00	1 year, 4 days
42	Morales v. Sholz Isuzu, Inc.	01/21/98	07/05/00	2 years, 5 months, 14 days
43	Mosiello v. Allstate Insurance Co.	01/06/99	09/29/00	1 year, 8 months, 23 days
44	Nakagawa v. C&C Moving and Storage	05/26/99	06/26/00	1 year, 1 month
45	Post v. Pleska	11/03/99 (Inquest)	03/28/01	1 year, 4 months, 25 days
46	Quirk v. Sprague	06/28/00		Pending as of 09/28/01

47	Reis v. Vanderheof (Touch of Gold)	01/20/99	09/24/00	1 year, 8 months, 4 days
48	Riemer v. Pearl	04/07/99	02/16/00	10 months, 9 days
49	Rossi-Gilman v. Galleria Furniture, Inc.	12/15/99	10/12/00	9 months, 27 days
50	Sanders v. Kavy	01/06/99	07/05/00	1 year, 5 months 29 days
51	Savino v. Peter Elliot Corp.	02/10/99	10/03/00	1 year, 7 months, 23 days
52	Soddano v. Brooks	01/07/98	01/05/99	11 months, 29 days
53	Soddano v. Soto	04/15/98	03/18/99	11 months, 3 days
54	Stein v. Nordstrom, Inc.	10/07/98	07/07/00	1 year, 9 months
55	Stevens v. Runge	03/03/99	07/05/00	1 year, 4 months, 2 days
56	Sturman v. Westchester Chrysler Plymouth Jeep Eagle, Inc.	09/01/99	09/26/00	1 year, 25 days
57	Sullivan v. Westchester Chrysler Plymouth Jeep	10/07/98	07/07/00	1 year, 9 months
58	Suthar v. White Plains Hotel	05/26/99	07/05/00	1 year, 1 month, 9 days
59	Taylor & Nagele v. Westchester Pet Shoppes, Inc.	02/10/99	10/12/00	1 year, 8 months, 2 days
60	Thadathil v. George	04/15/98	03/18/99	11 months, 3 days
61	Trinidad v. GA Insurance Co. of NY	07/29/98	07/05/00	1 year, 11 months, 6 days
62	Wagner v. Sellian	07/22/98	03/10/00	1 year, 7 months, 16 days

63	Waite v. Geyer	03/24/99	07/07/00	1 year, 3 months, 13 days
64	Weintraub v. Siegel	02/07/01		Pending as of 09/28/01
65	Westchester Moving & Delivery v. Brenhouse	05/14/97	06/30/98	1 year, 1 month, 16 days
66	White Plains Drapery & Upholstery v. Anker Management	04/05/00		Pending as of 09/28/01
67	Zayas v. Galleria Mall Space	12/15/99	10/03/00	9 months, 18 days

SCHEDULE 2

	<u>Case</u>	<u>Not reported in the following quarters:</u>
1	Alcena v. Whittle	July-Sept 1999 Oct-Dec 1999
2	Beck v. Abrahams	Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
3	Campbell v. Con Edison	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
4	Ciervo v. Carbone and Acciai Speciali Terni USA, Inc.	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
5	Clemente v. Basler	Jan-March 1998 Apr-June 1998
6	Corner Closet, Inc. v. Fabric Concepts (Goldberg v. Burke Fabric)	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
7	Duffy and Kelly v. White Plains Dodge	Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
8	Feinsod Hardware Co. v. Alfredo Landscaping & Consultants	July-Sept 1999 Oct-Dec 1999
9	Flamio v. Flamio	Oct-Dec 1999
10	George v. Metro Toyota	Jan-March 1999
11	Gross v. A. Palmeri Landscaping Co.	Jan-March 1999
12	Halpak Plastics, Inc. v. Bedemco Import-Export, Inc.	July-Sept 1999 Oct-Dec 1999
13	Harris v. Burke Fuel & Heating Co., Inc	Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
14	Johnson v. Meile	Jan-March 1999

15	Kronick v. Soltzer	Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
16	Larmon v. Horne	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
17	Lent v. The Bank of New York	Jan-March 1998 Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
18	Libsch v. Roger Rabin	July-Sept 1999 Oct-Dec 1999
19	Lyons v. Westchester Pavilion	Oct-Dec 1998
20	Mark v. Capital Quest, LLC	Oct-Dec 1999
21	Masso v. Seigetvari	Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
22	McDonald v. Lousberg	Jan-March 1998 Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
23	Meyer v. Masback	Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
24	Monteleone v. Arone	Oct-Dec 1999
25	Morales v. Sholz Isuzu, Inc.	Jan-March 1998 Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
26	Mosiello v. Allstate Insurance Co.	Jan-March 1999

27	Post v. Pleska	Jan-March 2000 Apr-June 2000 July-Sept 2000 Oct-Dec 2000
28	Reis v. Vanderheof (Touch of Gold)	Jan-March 1999
29	Sanders v. Kavy	Jan-March 1999
30	Soddano v. Brooks	Jan-March 1998 Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998
31	Soddano v. Soto	Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
32	Stein v. Nordstrom, Inc.	Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
33	Sturman v. Westchester Chrysler Plymouth Jeep Eagle, Inc.	Oct-Dec 1999
34	Sullivan v. Westchester Chrysler Plymouth Jeep	Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
35	Thadathil v. George	Apr-June 1998 July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998
36	Trinidad v. GA Insurance Co. of NY	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
37	Wagner v. Sellian	July-Sept 1998 Oct-Dec 1998 Jan-March 1999
38	Westchester Moving & Delivery v. Brenhouse	Jan-March 1998