

# New York Supreme Court

## APPELLATE DIVISION—FIRST DEPARTMENT

PAUL NICHOLS, GAVIN WAX, GARY GREENBERG,

*Petitioners-Appellants,*

—against—

CASE NO.

2022-02301

GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, SENATE MAJORITY LEADER AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE ANDREA STEWART-COUSINS, SPEAKER OF THE ASSEMBLY CARL HEASTIE, NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS, NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT,

*Respondents-Respondents.*

### SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD ON APPEAL

LETITIA JAMES  
NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL  
JEFFREY LANG  
ANDREA TRENTO  
SETH FARBER  
SPECIAL LITIGATION COUNSEL  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, New York 10005  
(212) 416-8000  
jeffrey.lang@ag.ny.gov  
andrea.trento@ag.ny.gov  
seth.farber@ag.ny.gov  
*Attorneys for Respondent-Respondent  
Governor Kathy Hochul*

ERIC J. HECKER  
ALEXANDER GOLDENBERG  
ALICE G. REITER  
CUTI HECKER WANG LLP  
305 Broadway, Suite 607  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 620-2600  
ehecker@chwillp.com  
agoldenberg@chwillp.com  
areiter@chwillp.com  
*Attorneys for Respondent-Respondent  
Senate Majority Leader Andrea  
Stewart-Cousins*

JIM WALDEN  
PETER A. DEVLIN  
WALDEN MACHT & HARAN LLP  
250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor  
New York, New York 10281  
(212) 335-2030  
jwalden@wmhlaw.com  
pdevlin@wmhlaw.com  
*Attorneys for Petitioners-Appellants  
Paul Nichols and Gary Greenberg*

AARON S. FOLDENAUER  
LAW OFFICE OF AARON S. FOLDENAUER  
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor  
New York, New York 10005  
(212) 961-6505  
aaron@nyelectionlaw.com

*Attorney for Petitioner-Appellant  
Gavin Wax*

KEVIN G. MURPHY  
BRIAN LEE QUAIL  
AARON K. SUGGS  
NEW YORK STATE BOARD  
OF ELECTIONS  
40 North Pearl Street, Suite 5  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 474-2063  
kevin.murphy@elections.ny.gov  
brian.quail@elections.ny.gov  
aaron.suggs@elections.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Respondent-Respondent  
New York State Board of Elections*

*(Counsel continued on inside cover)*

CRAIG R. BUCKI  
STEVEN B. SALCEDO  
REBECCA A. VALENTINE  
PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP  
One Canalside  
125 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203  
(716) 847-8400  
cbucki@phillipslytle.com  
ssalcedo@phillipslytle.com  
rvalentine@phillipslytle.com

C. DANIEL CHILL  
JOSEPH H. LESSEM  
ELAINE M. REICH  
GRAUBARD MILLER  
The Chrysler Building  
405 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor  
New York, New York 10174  
(212) 818-8800  
dchill@graubard.com  
jlessem@graubard.com  
ereich@graubard.com

*Attorneys for Respondent-Respondent  
Speaker of the Assembly Carl Heastie*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Court of Appeals Transfer Order, Notice of Appeal, and Informational Statement, filed on May 27, 2022 (App Div. NYSCEF No. 1) .....	SR1
Stipulation to File Supplemental Record, dated June 3, 2022 .....	SR26
Certification Pursuant to CPLR § 2105 .....	SR29

# SR1

**Court of Appeals Transfer Order, Notice of Appeal, and Informational  
Statement, filed on May 27, 2022 (App Div. NYSCEF No. 1)  
[pp. SR1 - SR25]**



*State of New York  
Court of Appeals*

*Lisa Le Cours  
Chief Clerk and  
Legal Counsel to the Court*

*Clerk's Office  
20 Eagle Street  
Albany, New York 12207-1095*

May 27, 2022

**VIA E-MAIL AND REGULAR MAIL**

Walden Macht & Haran LLP  
Attn: James Walden, Esq.  
250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor  
New York, NY 10281

Law Office of Aaron S. Foldenauer  
Attn: Aaron S. Foldenauer, Esq.  
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor  
New York, NY 10005

Re: Nichols v Hochul  
SSD 16

Dear Counselors:

Enclosed is this Court's order in the above-referenced appeal. The transfer of the appeal does not relieve appellants of the responsibility to timely pursue the appeal, if desired, to the Appellate Division. You may wish to contact the Clerk of the Appellate Division, First Department regarding the appropriate procedure to follow in that court.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lisa LeCours".

Lisa LeCours

RMM  
encl.

cc: Appellate Division, First Department  
Jeffrey W. Lang, Esq.  
Eric J. Hecker, Esq.  
Channing Chill, Esq.  
Craig R. Bucki, Esq.  
Kevin Murphy, Esq.

***State of New York***  
***Court of Appeals***

*Decided and Entered on the  
twenty-seventh day of May, 2022*

**Present**, Hon. Janet DiFiore, *Chief Judge, presiding.*

---

SSD 16

Paul Nichols, et al.,  
Appellants,

v.


Kathy Hochul, &c., et al.,  
Respondents.

---

Appellants having appealed to the Court of Appeals in the above cause;

Upon the papers filed and due deliberation, it is

ORDERED, that the appeal is transferred without costs, by the Court *sua sponte*, to the Appellate Division, First Department, upon the ground that a direct appeal does not lie when questions other than the constitutional validity of a statutory provision are involved (*see* NY Const, art VI, §§ 3 [b] [2], 5 [b]; CPLR 5601 [b] [2]).



---

Lisa LeCours  
Clerk of the Court

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORKPAUL NICHOLS, GAVIN WAX, and GARY  
GREENBERG

Petitioners,

Index No. 154213/2022

v.

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, SENATE  
MAJORITY LEADER AND PRESIDENT PRO  
TEMPORE OF THE SENATE ANDREA STEWART-  
COUSINS, SPEAKER OF THE ASSEMBLY CARL  
HEASTIE, NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF  
ELECTIONS, and THE NEW YORK STATE  
LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC  
RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT,

Respondents.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Petitioners Paul Nichols, Gavin Wax, and Gary Greenberg, pursuant to CPLR § 5601(b)(2), hereby appeal to the New York Court of Appeals from the Decision and Order of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County (Love, J.), dated May 25, 2022, duly entered in the Clerk's Office of the Supreme Court on the same date, *see* NYSCEF No. 91, and attached hereto as Exhibit A, finally determining and denying in its entirety the Petition, which Petition sought to invalidate the State Assembly map passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor on February 3, 2022, *see* 2021–2022 N.Y. Reg. Sess. Leg. Bills A.9040-A and A.9168, on the ground that the Legislature violated the exclusive method for redistricting provided in Article III, Section 4(b) of the New York Constitution. *See Harkenrider v. Hochul*, No. 60, 2022 WL 1236822 (N.Y. Apr. 27, 2022).

Dated: New York, NY  
May 25, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

**WALDEN MACHT & HARAN LLP**

By: *Jim Walden*  
Jim Walden  
Peter A. Devlin  
250 Vesey Street, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10281  
Tel: (212) 335-2030  
jwalden@wmhlaw.com  
pdevlin@wmhlaw.com

*Attorneys for Petitioners Paul Nichols and Gary  
Greenberg*

**LAW OFFICE OF AARON S. FOLDENAUER**

By: /s/ Aaron S. Foldenauer  
Aaron S. Foldenauer  
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
Tel: (212) 961-6505  
aaron@nyelectionlaw.com  
*Attorney for Petitioner Gavin Wax*

TO: All Counsel on record **via NYSCEF**

LETITIA JAMES, NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL  
Attorneys for Respondent Governor Kathy Hochul  
Seth Farber  
Special Litigation Counsel  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 416 – 8029  
seth.farber@ag.ny.gov

CUTI HECKER WANG LLP  
Attorneys for Respondent Senate Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins  
Eric J. Hecker  
Alexander Goldenberg  
Alice G. Reiter  
305 Broadway, Suite 607

New York, New York 10007  
(212) 620-2600  
echecker@chwillp.com  
agoldenberg@chwillp.com  
areiter@chwillp.com

**GRAUBARD MILLER**

Attorneys for Respondent Speaker of the Assembly Carl Heastie  
C. Daniel Chill  
Joseph H. Lessem  
Elaine M. Reich  
The Chrysler Building  
405 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor  
New York, New York 10174  
(212) 818-8800  
dchill@graubard.com  
jlessem@graubard.com  
ereich@graubard.com

**PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP**

Attorneys for Respondent Speaker of the Assembly Carl Heastie  
Craig R. Bucki  
Steven B. Salcedo  
Rebecca A. Valentine  
One Canalside  
125 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203-2887  
Telephone No. (716) 847-8400  
cbucki@phillipslytle.com  
ssalcedo@phillipslytle.com  
rvalentine@phillipslytle.com

**NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS**

Attorneys for Respondent  
Kevin G. Murphy  
Brian Lee Quail  
Aaron K. Suggs  
New York State Board of Elections  
40 N. Pearl Street, Suite 5  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 474-2063  
kevin.murphy@elections.ny.gov  
brian.quail@elections.ny.gov  
aaron.suggs@elections.ny.gov

# **EXHIBIT A**

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORKPAUL NICHOLS, GAVIN WAX, and GARY  
GREENBERG

Petitioners,

v.

GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, SENATE  
MAJORITY LEADER AND PRESIDENT PRO  
TEMPORE OF THE SENATE ANDREA  
STEWART-COUSINS, SPEAKER OF THE  
ASSEMBLY CARL HEASTIE, NEW YORK  
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS, and THE  
NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE TASK  
FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH  
AND REAPPORTIONMENT,

Respondents.

Index No. 154213/2022

**NOTICE OF ENTRY**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the within Decision/Order is a true copy of a Decision/Order entered by the Clerk of the Court of the Supreme Court, New York County on May 25, 2022.

Dated: New York, NY  
May 25, 2022

**WALDEN MACHT & HARAN LLP**By: *Jim Walden*

Jim Walden  
Peter A. Devlin  
250 Vesey Street, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10281  
Tel: (212) 335-2030  
[jwalden@wmhlaw.com](mailto:jwalden@wmhlaw.com)  
[pdevlin@wmhlaw.com](mailto:pdevlin@wmhlaw.com)

*Attorneys for Petitioners Paul Nichols and Gary  
Greenberg*

**LAW OFFICE OF AARON S. FOLDENAUER**

By: /s/ Aaron S. Foldenauer

Aaron S. Foldenauer

30 Wall Street, 8th Floor

New York, NY 10005

Tel: (212) 961-6505

[aaron@nyelectionlaw.com](mailto:aaron@nyelectionlaw.com)

*Attorney for Petitioner Gavin Wax*

TO: All Counsel on record via NYSCEF

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
NEW YORK COUNTY**

**PRESENT:** HON. LAURENCE LOVE **PART** **63M**

*Justice*

-----X

PAUL NICHOLS, GAVIN WAX, GARY GREENBERG,

Petitioner,

- v -

GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, SENATE MAJORITY  
LEADER AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE  
SENATE ANDREA STEWART-COUSINS, SPEAKER OF  
THE ASSEMBLY CARL HEASTIE, NEW YORK STATE  
BOARD OF ELECTIONS, NEW YORK STATE  
LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC  
RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT

Respondent.

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 2, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 82, 86, 87, 88

were read on this motion to/for

INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER

**DECISION + ORDER ON  
MOTION**

Upon the foregoing documents, the decision on Petitioners' Order to Show Cause, seeking an Order 1. Declaring pursuant to CPLR § 3001 that the 2022 state assembly map, ("New Assembly Map") see 2021– 2022 N.Y. Reg. Sess. Leg. Bills A.9040-A and A.9168, is void based upon the constitutional flaws in its adoption previously found by the Court of Appeals; 2. Appointing a special master to adopt a legally compliant state assembly map; 3. Enjoining Respondents to adjourn the primary election date for state and local elections to August 23, 2022, or, alternatively, September 13, 2022; 4. Enjoining Respondents to open designating and independent nominating petition periods, see N.Y. Elec. Law §§ 6-134, 6-138, for statewide, congressional, state assembly, state senate, and local offices with deadlines sufficient for current candidates to obtain new designating petition signatures or run independently, and for potential candidates to newly qualify for primary elections or as an independent in the general election; and

5. Suspending or enjoining the operation of any other state laws, or vacating any certifications or other official acts of the acts of the New York State Board of Elections or other governmental body, that would undermine this Court's ability to offer effective and complete relief for the November 2022 elections and related primaries and seeking a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction for related relief is as follows:

Petitioners commenced the instant Petition on May 15, 2022 seeking a declaration, pursuant to CPLR § 3001, that the New Assembly Map is void based upon the related ruling of the Court of Appeals in *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, 2022 N.Y. Slip Op. 02833, 2022 WL 1236822 ("Harkenrider III")(affirming as modified the Appellate Division, Fourth Department's ruling in *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, 2022 N.Y. Slip Op. 02648, 2022 WL 1193180 ["Harkenrider II"]) and the present Order to Show Cause was presented to this Court on May 18, 2022.

The Court heard oral argument in this matter on May 23, 2022, wherein all parties had an opportunity to highlight their positions. To be clear, there were representations made by both sides via hearsay and speculation as to motives of various parties, alleged investigations and conspiracy theories. Said representations are irrelevant, have no place in the matter before the Court and are therefore being disregarded.

The Court is fully aware of the prior litigation initiated in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Steuben County, which was appealed to the Appellate Division, Fourth Department and thereafter the New York State Court of Appeals which resulted in the matter being remanded to Steuben County, where a special master was appointed, who created new congressional and state senate maps on May 20, 2022

The instant matter cannot be properly addressed without a clear understanding of the timeline concerning the adoption of and resulting challenges to the redistricting maps for the New

York state assembly, the state senate and congress in New York. On February 2, 2022 the New York State Legislature passed and Governor Kathy Hochul signed into law the aforementioned new maps. On the same day, Petitioners, Tim Harkenrider, *et. al.* filed a Petition in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Steuben County, entitled *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, under Index No. E2022-0116CV, challenging the constitutionality of the redistricting map for the United States congress and thereafter on February 8, 2022, Petitioners filed an Amended Petition further challenging the constitutionality of the redistricting map for the New York state senate, which specifically stated that no challenge was being pursued related to the New Assembly Map. No parties, including but not limited to Petitioners in the present action, sought to intervene or otherwise challenge the New Assembly Map at that time. On March 31, 2022, following a bench trial, the Hon. Patrick F. McAllister, A.J.S.C. issued an Order declaring not only that the United States congressional and state senate maps are unconstitutional based upon partisan gerrymandering, but also sua sponte ruled that the New Assembly Map was similarly invalid. On April 21, 2022 the Appellate Division, Fourth Department, issued a ruling in pertinent part reversing the lower court's ruling as to the New York state senate and assembly maps. Thereafter, on April 27, 2022, the Court of Appeals issued a decision affirming, as modified, the Appellate Division's holding in *Harkenrider II*, invalidating the congressional and state senate maps and remanding the matter to the Supreme Court, Steuben County to, with the assistance of the special master and other relevant submissions adopt constitutional maps with all due haste, recognizing that "Although it will likely be necessary to move the congressional and senate primary elections to August, New York routinely held a bifurcated primary until recently, with some primaries occurring as late as September. We are confident that, in consultation with the Board of Elections, Supreme Court can swiftly develop a schedule to facilitate an August primary election, allowing

time for the adoption of new constitutional maps, the dissemination of correct information to voters, the completion of the petitioning process, and compliance with federal voting laws, including the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (see 52 USC § 20302).” Vital to the matter before this Court, the Court of Appeals found that “Inasmuch as petitioners neither sought invalidation of the 2022 state assembly redistricting legislation in their pleadings nor challenge in this Court the Appellate Division’s vacatur of the relief granted by Supreme Court with respect to that map, we may not invalidate the assembly map despite its procedural infirmity.” *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, 2022 WL 1236822, at \*11, footnote 15.

Following the Court of Appeals ruling in *Harkenrider III*, Petitioners Gavin Wax and Gary Greenberg moved pursuant to CPLR §1012 and §1013 to intervene in the Steuben County case for the express purpose of having the assembly map declared unconstitutional and redrawn by the special master. On May 11, 2022, the Supreme Court denied the Petitioners’ motion to intervene. In denying said motion, Acting Justice McAllister specifically found that,

From the time the Petitioners filed their Amended Petition in early to mid-February it was clear that the Petitioners were not specifically challenging the Assembly maps. (pg. 1)

Although this court’s ruling on March 31, 2022 *sua sponte* threw out the Assembly maps there was nothing in the proceedings leading up to the court’s decision that would have led these putative intervenors to think that the Assembly District maps were being included in this action. (pg. 2)

both Greenberg and Wax were aware of this pending action shortly after it was commenced in February, 2022. Hence, it cannot be said the putative intervenors did not know about the action or the potential impact it could have on them. Yet they chose to do nothing at that time. (pg. 3)

Not only do intervenors, Greenberg and Wax, want new Assembly maps, but they are asking the court to invalidate all the signatures previously gathered, create new time periods for gathering signatures after new maps are enacted, change the

signature requirements for both primary and independent petitions, etc. Overseas primary ballots for the June 28, 2022 primary are scheduled to be mailed out this week on May 13th. (pg. 3)

The court is mindful that a change in the Assembly Districts would impact several other elected officials. This would include delegates to the State Supreme Court judicial nominating conventions, representatives to county party committees, and the New York State Democratic Committee. In the case of the judicial nominating conventions they are normally held in early August which would be well before the August 23rd primary. So the judicial nominating conventions would have to be pushed back until some time in September making it difficult, if not impossible, for their work to be completed so candidates could be placed on the November ballot. The overseas ballots for the November election must be mailed in September to meet Federal election requirements.

For the above reasons, said motion was denied as untimely. Said ruling was not appealed. Instead, petitioners filed the instant Petition and Order to Show Cause seeking a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction on or about Sunday, May 15, 2022.

A preliminary injunction is appropriate when the party seeking injunctive relief establishes: (1) likelihood of ultimate success on the merits; (2) irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted; and (3) a balancing of the equities in its favor. *See Four Times Square Assocs., L.L.C. v. Cigna Investments, Inc.*, 306 A.D.2d 4, 5 (1st Dep't 2003) (citing *Grant Co. v. Srogi*, 52 N.Y.2d 496, 517 (1981)); CPLR §§ 6301, 6311. The elements to be satisfied must be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence. *Liotta v. Mattone*, 71 A.D.3d 741 (2nd Dep't, 2010). However, the moving party is only required to make a *prima facie* showing of its entitlement to a preliminary injunction, not prove the entirety of its case on the merits. The decision to grant a motion for a preliminary injunction "is committed to the sound discretion of the trial court." *N.Y. Cnty. Lawyers' Ass'n v. State*, 192 Misc. 2d 424, 428-29 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cnty. 2002); *see also Terrell v. Terrell*, 279 A.D.2d 301, 304 (1st Dep't 2001).

Petitioners contend that they are assured of ultimate success on the merits based upon the Court of Appeals' ruling in Harkenrider III, which held that the congressional and state senate maps drawn by the Legislature were procedurally unconstitutional, mentioning in a footnote that the assembly maps are procedurally infirm but were never challenged and as such would not be invalidated. The Court notes that the neither the senate nor assembly maps were found to be substantively unconstitutional as drawn with impermissible partisan purpose. Further, as noted above, the Court of Appeals' only reference to the assembly map was within a footnote indicating that same was procedurally infirm. By no means does the Court seek to minimize the Court of Appeals reference to the assembly maps being procedurally infirm, however the realistic remedy, if any, to be taken at this late juncture remains an open question.

Clearly, the Court of Appeals in Harkenrider III had an opportunity to address the congressional and state senate maps simultaneously arising from the February litigation and saw fit, upon finding procedural constitutional issues with the state senate map, to include same within their order directing the State Supreme Court, Steuben County, with the assistance of a special master to produce valid constitutional maps for an August primary date. Nothing in the Court of Appeals' decision was directed at the validity of the assembly map. As all are aware, no action was filed disputing the assembly map, put into law on February 2, 2022 until the filing of the instant motion some three plus months later. Petitioners' argument might be plausible had they filed the instant action in a timely manner. However, it has been repeatedly found that Petitioners were aware, from the filing of said action, that the New Assembly Map was not being challenged in Harkenrider and that said Petitioners utterly failed to timely intervene in that action.

Petitioners further contend that they will suffer irreparable harm as "With each day that passes, the State's election machinery moves closer to a point of no return, where New Yorkers

must face the Faustian bargain of whether to hold an unconstitutional election” and accusing Respondents of attempting to run out the clock. Contrary to this argument, Petitioners have run out the clock on themselves, waiting until the week that the new congressional and senate maps were released to file the instant action. This is evidenced by Petitioners’ failure to even attempt to intervene in the Steuben action until May 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022. Further, in accordance with State and Federal law, ballots for the June 28th primaries were finalized and mailed to military voters by May 13, 2022, prior to the filing of the instant action. As such, the Petitioners are not likely to succeed on the merits and have failed to establish that the equities are balanced in their favor.

Petitioners’ action is also clearly barred by the equitable doctrine of laches. Similar to *Matter of Cantrell v. Hayduk*, 45 N.Y.2d 925 (1978), rather than acting with due diligence Petitioners allowed more than three months to pass before filing the instant action. An action is barred by laches if there has been a delay in bringing the claim and prejudice caused by the delay, *Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce v. Pataki*, 100 N.Y.2d 801, 816 (2003). While a delay of only three months may not seem consequential, the prejudice caused by the delay in this instance is substantial. Petitioners’ belated attempt to invalidate the New Assembly Map did not occur in a vacuum and the chaos that would be wrought by potentially finding the said map unconstitutional at this juncture would be devastating in its repercussions. The Court already referenced the many reasons that were raised in the Steuben County decision denying Petitioners’ motion to intervene in that case. All of the reasons enumerated therein are as valid now, if not more so two weeks later. As Respondents have repeatedly stressed, the drawing of new assembly districts not only affects the Candidates for the one hundred and fifty seats in the assembly itself but literally thousands of other elected positions across the state. Ballots for those primaries have been finalized. Every local Board of Elections has already issued ballots to military voters. As directed in the Steuben County

action, the remedial congressional and state senate maps were finalized on May 20, 2022. This is especially significant as said maps were required to be finalized by May 20, 2022 so that the congressional and state senate primaries could be held on August 23, 2022. The congressional and state senate primary is now in place and cannot be delayed further by this Court.

Respondents further argue that the instant action is barred by the applicable statute of limitations as pursuant to Election Law § 16-102(2), a “proceeding with respect to a petition shall be instituted within fourteen days after the last day to file the petition.” The last day to file designating petitions was April 7, 2022 and as such, the last day to challenge said petitions was April 21, 2022, prior to the filing of the instant action. The Court notes that this argument is not entirely on point as the instant action is not a challenge to any one or group of designating petitions but would have the effect of nullifying all of them. While not entirely relevant to the instant action, the statute of limitations in § 16-102(2) is instructive on the absolute importance of the timely filing of election challenges and is certainly relevant to Respondents’ laches argument.

The untimeliness of Petitioners’ action is further complicated by the fact that assembly districts are the building block upon which New York’s political infrastructure exists. A political party’s county level representatives must reside in the assembly district containing the election district in which the member is elected, *See*, Election Law § 2-104(1). Representatives to the New York State Democratic Committee are determined by assembly district, *See*, Election Law § 2-102. Delegates to the state Supreme Court judicial-nominating conventions are elected “from each assembly district” *See*, Election Law § 6-124. All of these positions are traditionally listed on designating petitions and all would be invalidated under Petitioners’ plans. As a consequence, all of those potential elected officials would be forced to gather new signatures on designating petitions and as such would be inequitably affected by the instant action. Not only would the result

be chaos, but all of those candidates are for that reason necessary parties to this action, without which the instant action must arguably be dismissed, *See, Clinton v. Board of Elections of City of New York*, 2021 WL 3891600 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. County Aug. 26, 2021), *aff'd*, 197 A.D.3d 1025 (1st Dep't 2021); *Matter of Masich v. Ward*, 65 A.D.3d 817, 817 (4th Dep't 2009).

Petitioners' argument that there is sufficient time, at this late hour for the Court to hear full arguments, determine the New Assembly Map is unconstitutional and then appoint a special master to draw up another new assembly map, after appropriate review and consultation is bewildering to even contemplate and is an impossibility. Only after the new maps are drawn could thousands of candidates seeking positions throughout the State even begin to collect signatures to run in the new districts, placing an overwhelming cost of time and money, not only on all of those prospective candidates, but on the County Boards of Elections statewide. Petitioners filed the instant action after falling asleep at the switch in February when others promptly acted with challenges. Their last-minute attempt to intervene months later after realizing their own error was soundly rejected and only now – so late in the election calendar – do they seek to upend the entire New York State election process in an impossible manner.

Petitioners contend that if the state assembly primary election or in the alternative all primary elections are moved to September 13, 2022 that there will be enough time to complete the extensive process laid out above. This is demonstrably false. As described in the affidavits of Kristen Zebrowski Stavisky and Todd D. Valentine, Co-Executive Directors for the New York State Board of Elections, submitted in opposition to Petitioners' motion to intervene in the Steuben County action, "Moving a third election-i.e., the assembly primary-would place additional, potentially unbearable burdens on the State's election system. In particular because the June 28 primary has already been certified by state and local boards of elections, ballots have been or are

being prepared across the state based on that certification and ballots are to be sent for the June primary, including those primaries being held within the one hundred and fifty Assembly Districts across the state before Friday, May 13, 2022 as that is the deadline under state law to send military and overseas ballots for the June 28th election as provided for by Election Law 10-108.” Said affidavits further establish that replacing the assembly map would have grave effects on all of the other elections scheduled for June 28th. Further, simply moving these primaries to be combined with the congressional and state senate primaries to be held on August 23, 2022 is a non-starter as it is already too late to establish new assembly maps, circulate designating petitions, approve candidates, print new ballots and hold a combined primary election in such a short timeframe.

Petitioners’ contention that the assembly primaries or all primaries should be delayed to September 13, 2022 is also an impossibility. Not only would such an Order conflict with Acting Justice McAllister’s Order setting the primaries for congress and the state senet on August 23, 2022, but under the federal Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (“UOCAVA”), 52 U.S.C. § 20302(a)(8), New York must mail ballots to military and overseas voters at least 45 days before the primary and general elections. This timeframe ensures that those voters, some of whom live on the other side of the world, will receive ballots in time to cast their vote and for those votes to be counted. In the past, New York State has been ruled unable to comply with UOCAVA when holding September primaries, *See, United States v. State of New York*, 2012 WL 254263 (N.D.N.Y. 2012). Petitioners contend that UOCAVA does not apply to non-federal elections, however delaying any of the primaries until September necessarily prevents the general election ballot from complying with UOCAVA and as such, moving the primary elections to September is an impossibility.

In addition to reviewing all the filings in this matter, during oral argument the Court heard from counsel to the New York State Board of Elections, who made a persuasive argument that there was simply insufficient time to hold a September 13<sup>th</sup> primary, with early voting requirements for assembly and related offices. The physical dynamics of completing the election process vis-à-vis programming the voting machines for the August 23, 2022 mandated primary for congress and state senate and thereafter reprogramming said voting machines for an additional statewide primary in mid-September is not just difficult but impossible. The Court must also be mindful of the November 8<sup>th</sup> general election date which cannot be altered, and sufficient time must exist between the primary and said general elections.

Petitioners said it themselves as previously argued “With each day that passes, the State’s election machinery moves closer to a point of no return...” This Court does not have the ability to stop time and the unfortunate reality is that we have already passed that point of no return. To paraphrase the well known quote – Democracy is not a perfect system, but it is the best available, so too allowing the assembly map to stand is not a perfect solution but it remains the best available.

ORDERED that Petitioners’ Order to Show Cause is DENIED in its entirety.

Following submission of the instant Petition, this Court received a letter from Petitioners’ counsel, e-filed as NYSCEF Document No. 89, requesting that should this Court deny Petitioners’ Order to Show Cause, that the Court enter a final judgment determining the Petition. As such, it is hereby

ORDERED that the instant Petition is DENIED in its entirety.

5/25/2022

DATE

CHECK ONE:

☒

CASE DISPOSED

☐

GRANTED

☒

DENIED

☐

NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

☐

GRANTED IN PART

☐

OTHER

LAURENCE LOVE, J.S.C.

# SR20

**FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 05/25/2022 04:09 PM**

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 92

INDEX NO. 154213/2022

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/25/2022

APPLICATION:

☐

SETTLE ORDER

☐

SUBMIT ORDER

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:

☐

INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

☐

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

☐

REFERENCE

# Supreme Court of the State of New York

## Appellate Division: First      Judicial Department

Informational Statement (Pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1250.3 [a]) - Civil

**Case Title:** Set forth the title of the case as it appears on the summons, notice of petition or order to show cause by which the matter was or is to be commenced, or as amended.

Paul Nichols, Gavin Wax, and Gary Greenberg

- against -

Governor Kathy Hochul, Senate Majority Leader And President Pro Tempore Of The Senate Andrea Stewart-Cousins, Speaker Of The Assembly Carl Heastie, New York State Board Of Elections, and the New York State Legislative Task Force On Demographic Research And Reapportionment

For Court of Original Instance

Date Notice of Appeal Filed

For Appellate Division

Case Type		Filing Type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Civil Action <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR article 75 Arbitration	<input type="checkbox"/> CPLR article 78 Proceeding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Proceeding Other <input type="checkbox"/> Habeas Corpus Proceeding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal <input type="checkbox"/> Original Proceedings <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR Article 78 <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent Domain <input type="checkbox"/> Labor Law 220 or 220-b <input type="checkbox"/> Public Officers Law § 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Real Property Tax Law § 1278	<input type="checkbox"/> Transferred Proceeding <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR Article 78 <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Law § 298 <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR 5704 Review

**Nature of Suit:** Check up to three of the following categories which best reflect the nature of the case.

<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Business Relationships	<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> Contracts
<input type="checkbox"/> Declaratory Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Relations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Election Law	<input type="checkbox"/> Estate Matters
<input type="checkbox"/> Family Court	<input type="checkbox"/> Mortgage Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> Miscellaneous	<input type="checkbox"/> Prisoner Discipline & Parole
<input type="checkbox"/> Real Property (other than foreclosure)	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory	<input type="checkbox"/> Taxation	<input type="checkbox"/> Torts

Appeal	
Paper Appealed From (Check one only):	If an appeal has been taken from more than one order or judgment by the filing of this notice of appeal, please indicate the below information for each such order or judgment appealed from on a separate sheet of paper.
<input type="checkbox"/> Amended Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Amended Judgement <input type="checkbox"/> Amended Order <input type="checkbox"/> Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Decree	<input type="checkbox"/> Determination <input type="checkbox"/> Finding <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order <input type="checkbox"/> Order & Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Order <input type="checkbox"/> Ruling <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):
Court: <b>Supreme Court</b>	County: <b>New York</b>
Dated: <b>05/25/2022</b>	Entered: <b>5/25/2022</b>
Judge (name in full): <b>Laurence Love, J.S.C.</b>	Index No.: <b>154213/2022</b>
Stage: <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Final	Trial: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Jury <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Jury
Prior Unperfected Appeal and Related Case Information	
Are any appeals arising in the same action or proceeding currently pending in the court? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please set forth the Appellate Division Case Number assigned to each such appeal.	
Where appropriate, indicate whether there is any related action or proceeding now in any court of this or any other jurisdiction, and if so, the status of the case:	
Original Proceeding	
Commenced by: <input type="checkbox"/> Order to Show Cause <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Habeas Corpus Date Filed:	
Statute authorizing commencement of proceeding in the Appellate Division:	
Proceeding Transferred Pursuant to CPLR 7804(g)	
Court: <b>Choose Court</b>	County: <b>Choose County</b>
Judge (name in full):	Order of Transfer Date:
CPLR 5704 Review of Ex Parte Order:	
Court: <b>Choose Court</b>	County: <b>Choose County</b>
Judge (name in full):	Dated:
Description of Appeal, Proceeding or Application and Statement of Issues	
Description: If an appeal, briefly describe the paper appealed from. If the appeal is from an order, specify the relief requested and whether the motion was granted or denied. If an original proceeding commenced in this court or transferred pursuant to CPLR 7804(g), briefly describe the object of proceeding. If an application under CPLR 5704, briefly describe the nature of the ex parte order to be reviewed.	
Petitioners' appeal from the Decision and Order of the Supreme Court, New York County (Love, J.) denying Petitioners' Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Relief and denying the Petition in full. Petitioners sought preliminary relief to restrain Respondents from using the current Assembly district map in the 2022 election cycle, and Petitioners requested immediate appointment of a special master to evaluate and draft a new Assembly map. The Petition further seeks to invalidate the current Assembly map, enjoin all state and local primaries to August 23, 2022, or September 13, 2022, and reopen ballot-access designating and nominating petition periods.	

**Issues:** Specify the issues proposed to be raised on the appeal, proceeding, or application for CPLR 5704 review, the grounds for reversal, or modification to be advanced and the specific relief sought on appeal.

(1) The Court of Appeals held in *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, No. 60, 2022 WL 1236822 (N.Y. Apr. 27, 2022), that the method used by the Legislature to enact Congressional, Senate, and Assembly district maps violated Article III of the New York Constitution. The Court, however, declined to invalidate the Assembly map "despite its procedural infirmity" because the petitioners in *Harkenrider* did not seek such relief. *Id.* at \*11 n.15. Is the Assembly map, enacted in 2021–2022 N.Y. Reg. Sess. Leg. Bills A.9040-A and A.9168, invalid under Article III? The Supreme Court erred by holding that the *Harkenrider* decision did not rule on the constitutionality of the Assembly map. This is a pure question of law. Petitioners request the First Department invalidate the Assembly map.

(2) Section 5 of Article III of the New York Constitution provides that any law establishing districts found to violate Article III "shall be invalid in whole or in part." Section 5 further provides that an apportionment "shall be subject to review" by the supreme court. Can a supreme court avoid ruling on the validity of such a law by imposing a requirement that a challenge be "timely" or applying the equitable doctrine of laches, when the Constitution mandates review and invalidation? The Supreme Court erred by holding that the Petition is untimely and barred by laches. Petitioners request that the First Department hold that the Petition is timely and not barred by laches.

(3) Within four and six days of the Court of Appeals' April 27, 2022, decision in *Harkenrider*, Petitioners' Greenberg and Wax, moved to intervene in the Supreme Court, Steuben County, seeking the relief sought in the instant Petition. Within four days of the denial of intervention, Petitioners commenced the instant special proceeding in the Supreme Court, New York County. Had Petitioners commenced their action when the Assembly map was enacted on February 3, 2022, no relief would have been granted any earlier than April 27, 2022. Is the Petition untimely or otherwise barred by the equitable doctrine of laches? The Supreme Court erred by holding that the Petition is untimely and barred by laches. Petitioners request that the First Department hold that the Petition is timely and not barred by laches.

Petitioners further request that the First Department order all appropriate relief to the Legislature's unconstitutional action, including granting the relief requested in the Petition.

### Party Information

**Instructions:** Fill in the name of each party to the action or proceeding, one name per line. If this form is to be filed for an appeal, indicate the status of the party in the court of original instance and his, her, or its status in this court, if any. If this form is to be filed for a proceeding commenced in this court, fill in only the party's name and his, her, or its status in this court.

No.	Party Name	Original Status	Appellate Division Status
1	Paul Nichols	Petitioner	Appellant
2	Gavin Wax	Petitioner	Appellant
3	Gary Greenberg	Petitioner	Appellant
4	Governor Kathy Hochul	Respondent	Respondent
5	Senate Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins	Respondent	Respondent
6	Speaker of the Assembly Carl Heastie	Respondent	Respondent
7	New York State Board of Elections	Respondent	Respondent
8	New York State Legislative Task Force on Demographic Research and Reapportionment	Respondent	Respondent
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

## Attorney Information

Instructions: Fill in the names of the attorneys or firms for the respective parties. If this form is to be filed with the notice of petition or order to show cause by which a special proceeding is to be commenced in the Appellate Division, only the name of the attorney for the petitioner need be provided. In the event that a litigant represents herself or himself, the box marked "Pro Se" must be checked and the appropriate information for that litigant must be supplied in the spaces provided.

Attorney/Firm Name: Jim Walden and Peter Devlin/Walden Macht & Haran LLP

Address: 250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor

City: New York State: NY Zip: 10281 Telephone No: 212-335-2030

E-mail Address: jwalden@wmhlaw.com and pdevlin@wmhlaw.com

Attorney Type: ☒ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 1 and 3

Attorney/Firm Name: Aaron S. Foldenauer/Law off of Aaron S. Foldenauer

Address: 30 Wall Street, 8th Floor

City: New York State: NY Zip: 10005 Telephone No: 212-961-6505

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☒ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 2

Attorney/Firm Name: Seth Farber/Letitia James, New York Attorney General

Address: 28 Liberty Street

City: New York State: NY Zip: 10005 Telephone No: 212-416-8029

E-mail Address: seth.farber@ag.ny.gov

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☒ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 4

Attorney/Firm Name: Eric J. Hecker, Alexander Goldenberg, and Alice G. Reiter/Cuti Hecker Wang LLP

Address: 305 Broadway, Suite 607

City: New York State: NY Zip: 10007 Telephone No: 212-620-2600

E-mail Address: ehecker@chwllp.com, agoldenberg@chwllp.com, and areiter@chwllp.com

Attorney Type: ☒ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 5

Attorney/Firm Name: C. Daniel Chill, Joseph H. Lessem, and Elaine M. Reich/Graubard Miller

Address: 405 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor

City: New York State: NY Zip: 10174 Telephone No: 212-818-8800

E-mail Address: dchill@graubard.com, jlessem@graubard.com, and ereich@graubard.com

Attorney Type: ☒ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 6

Attorney/Firm Name: Craig R. Bucki, Steven B. Salcedo, Rebecca A. Valentine/Phillips Lytle LLP

Address: One Canalside 125 Main Street

City: Buffalo State: NY Zip: 14203 Telephone No: 716-847-8400

E-mail Address: cbucki@phillipslytle.com, ssalcedo@phillipslytle.com, and rvalentine@phillipslytle.com

Attorney Type: ☒ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 6

## Attorney Information

Instructions: Fill in the names of the attorneys or firms for the respective parties. If this form is to be filed with the notice of petition or order to show cause by which a special proceeding is to be commenced in the Appellate Division, only the name of the attorney for the petitioner need be provided. In the event that a litigant represents herself or himself, the box marked "Pro Se" must be checked and the appropriate information for that litigant must be supplied in the spaces provided.

Attorney/Firm Name: Kevin G. Murphy Brian Lee Quail and Aaron K. Suggs/New York State Board of Elections

Address: 40 N. Pearl Street, Suite 5

City: Albany State: NY Zip: 12207 Telephone No: 518-474-2063

E-mail Address: kevin.murphy@elections.ny.gov, brian.quail@elections.ny.gov, and aaron.suggs@elections.ny.gov

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☒ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 7

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip: Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):7

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip: Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):7

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip: Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):7

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip: Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):7

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip: Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type: ☐ Retained ☐ Assigned ☐ Government ☐ Pro Se ☐ Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):7

# SR26

Stipulation to File Supplemental Record, dated June 3, 2022  
[pp. SR26 - SR28]

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
APPELLATE DIVISION—FIRST DEPARTMENT

PAUL NICHOLS, GAVIN WAX, and GARY  
GREENBERG

Petitioners,

v.

GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, SENATE  
MAJORITY LEADER AND PRESIDENT PRO  
TEMPORE OF THE SENATE ANDREA STEWART-  
COUSINS, SPEAKER OF THE ASSEMBLY CARL  
HEASTIE, NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF  
ELECTIONS, and THE NEW YORK STATE  
LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC  
RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT,

Respondents.

**New York County  
Clerk's Index  
No. 154213/2022**

**Appellate Division  
No. 2022-02301**

The Parties to the above-captioned action, by and through their undersigned counsel, as directed by the Clerk of Court, hereby agree upon and stipulate to supplement the Record on Appeal with the Order of the New York Court of Appeals dated May 27, 2022, transferring the appeal, *sua sponte*, to the Appellate Division, First Department, and the accompanying Notice of Appeal and Informational Statement, which were filed with the Appellate Division, First Department on May 27, 2022 (*see* NYSCEF No. 1).

Dated: New York, NY  
June 3, 2022

**RESPONDENTS-RESPONDENTS**

/s/ Jeffrey Lang  
LETITIA JAMES, NEW YORK  
ATTORNEY GENERAL  
Jeffrey Lang  
Andrea Trento  
Seth Farber  
Special Litigation Counsel  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 416-8029  
jeffrey.lang@ag.ny.gov  
andrea.trento@ag.ny.gov  
seth.farber@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Respondent Governor  
Kathy Hochul*

/s/ Eric Hecker  
CUTI HECKER WANG LLP  
Eric J. Hecker  
Alexander Goldenberg  
Alice G. Reiter  
305 Broadway, Suite 607  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 620-2600  
ehecker@chwllp.com  
agoldenberg@chwllp.com  
areiter@chwllp.com

*Attorneys for Respondent Senate  
Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins*

**PETITIONERS-APPELLANTS**

/s/ Jim Walden  
WALDEN MACHT & HARAN LLP  
Jim Walden  
Peter A. Devlin  
250 Vesey Street, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10281  
Tel: (212) 335-2030  
jwalden@wmhlaw.com  
pdevlin@wmhlaw.com

*Attorneys for Petitioners Paul Nichols  
and Gary Greenberg*

/s/ Aaron S. Foldenauer  
LAW OFFICE OF AARON S.  
FOLDENAUER  
Aaron S. Foldenauer  
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
Tel: (212) 961-6505  
aaron@nyelectionlaw.com

*Attorney for Petitioner Gavin Wax*



---

PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP

Craig R. Bucki  
Steven B. Salcedo  
Rebecca A. Valentine  
One Canalside  
125 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203-2887  
Telephone No. (716) 847-8400  
cbucki@phillipslytle.com  
ssalcedo@phillipslytle.com  
rvalentine@phillipslytle.com

GRAUBARD MILLER

C. Daniel Chill  
Joseph H. Lessem  
Elaine M. Reich  
The Chrysler Building  
405 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor  
New York, New York 10174  
(212) 818-8800

*Attorneys for Respondent Speaker of the  
Assembly Carl Heastie*

*/s/ Brian Quail*

---

NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF  
ELECTIONS

Kevin G. Murphy  
Brian Lee Quail  
Aaron K. Suggs  
New York State Board of Elections  
40 N. Pearl Street, Suite 5  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 474-2063  
kevin.murphy@elections.ny.gov  
brian.quail@elections.ny.gov  
aaron.suggs@elections.ny.gov

# SR29

## Certification Pursuant to CPLR § 2105

### CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO CPLR § 2105

I, Peter Devlin, a member of the firm of Walden Macht & Haran LLP, *Attorneys for Petitioners-Appellants*, hereby certify pursuant to § 2105 of the CPLR that the foregoing papers constituting the Supplemental Record have been personally compared by me with the originals filed herein and have been found to be true and complete copies of said originals and the whole thereof, all of which are now on file in the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court, County of New York.

Dated: June 6, 2022

Walden Macht & Haran LLP

By:



---

Peter Devlin

*Attorneys for Petitioners-Appellants*