

14100003

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

Index No. \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
Purchase Date:

-----X

Gwen Goodwin,	:	SUMMONS
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
-v-	:	VENUE: Plaintiff designates
MELISSA MARK-VIVERITO, and	:	New York County as the
EASTSIDE MANAGERS' ASSOCIATES, INC.	:	Place of Trial, based on
Defendants.	:	Plaintiff's residence in
	:	New York County.

-----X

To the above named Defendants:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the complaint of the Plaintiff(s) herein and to serve a copy of your answer on the Plaintiff(s) at the address indicated below within 20 days after the service of this Summons (not counting the day of service itself), or within 30 days after service is complete if the summons is not delivered personally to you within the State of New York.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT should you fail to answer, a judgment will be entered against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

Dated: New York, New York  
December 30, 2013

**FILED**

**JAN 02 2014**

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gwen Goodwin, pro se  
 Plaintiff  
 152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street  
 (212) 534-0963

To: **COUNTY CLERKS OFFICE  
NEW YORK**

- Melissa Mark-Viverito, Home: 211 East 111<sup>th</sup> Street #2, New York, NY 10029; District Office: 105 East 116<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, NY 10035; Legislative Office: 250 Broadway #1882, New York, NY 10007.
- Eastside Managers' Associates, Inc., 234 East 121<sup>st</sup> Street, New York, NY 10035.

NOTE: THIS FORM OF SUMMONS MUST BE SERVED WITH A COMPLAINT

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

Index No. \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

-----X

Gwen Goodwin, :  
Plaintiff, :  
-v- :  
MELISSA MARK-VIVERITO, and :  
EASTSIDE MANAGERS' :  
ASSOCIATES, INC., :  
Defendants. :

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

-----X

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The complaint of GWEN GOODWIN against MELISSA MARK-VIVERITO and EASTSIDE MANAGERS' ASSOCIATES, INC., shows and alleges as follows.

**PARTIES**

1. The Plaintiff herein, Gwen Goodwin, is a resident of the State, City and County of New York, residing at 152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street therein at all time mentioned and relevant herein.

2. The Defendant herein, Melissa Mark-Viverito, on information and belief, is a resident of the State, City and County of New York, residing at 112 East 111<sup>th</sup> Street therein at all times mentioned and relevant herein, and is hereafter referred to as "MMV".

3. The Defendant herein, EASTSIDE MANAGERS' ASSOCIATES, INC., is a corporation which is the owner and/or landlord of the building, or property, in which the Plaintiff Gwen Goodwin resides, and is hereafter referred to variously as the "landlord", the "owner", and "EMA".

#### **4. BACKGROUND**

5. The Plaintiff and the Defendant were opponents in the Democratic Party Primary Election, held on September 10, 2013, for the Democratic Party nomination for New York City Council in and for District 8, thereof, the Defendant being the incumbent, at all times herein mentioned and relevant.

6. Having been certified as the Democratic Party nominee as a result of official Primary results, and having been officially certified as duly elected in the general election held on November 5, 2013, the Defendant is scheduled to assume an additional, or third, consecutive term, to commence on January 1, 2014.

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

7. Jointly and severally, at the apparent initiative of Defendant MMV, the conduct of the Defendants has been extreme

and outrageous, intentionally calculated to cause, and causing, the infliction of emotional distress, from which the Plaintiff has suffered.

8. On or about September 1, 2013, after several days of preliminary preparation, a ceremony took place at which a mural (Exhibit A), painted on the eastern wall of the building located at and known as 152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street, was unveiled.

9. At that time and place, Defendant MMV was present, as were agents, employees, servants, officers and/or principals of Defendant EMA, including "Jerry", participating in the ceremony.

10. The mural took up most of the height of the wall, up to the top (5<sup>th</sup>) floor, where the apartment (5E) of the Plaintiff is located.

11. More to the point, the mural abutted the bottom and north side of the east window of Plaintiff's apartment (#5E), and the corner formed by the intersection thereof.

12. The mural depicted a decapitated and wooden-sword-stabbed bird of prey, on information and belief, and according to neighbors of Puerto Rican and other backgrounds, in the Caribbean culture, this constituted a curse and a death threat,

as a swastika or a noose would symbolize typically to many Jews or African Americans, respectively.

13. The subject mural, according to a *New York Daily News* article of September 4, 2013 (Exhibit B), was a result of substantial planning on the part of the Defendants, jointly and severally: As said *Daily News* article documents, "Months earlier, Eastside Managers Associates, which owns Goodwin's building at 152 E. 100th St., volunteered the walk-up's facade to Los Muros Hablan a multi-borough project spearheaded by Mark-Viverito and the El Museo del Barrio."

14. On information and belief, these reported facts establish that jointly and severally, the hired and funded creation of the subject mural was planned over months, deliberate and intentional on the part of both Defendants, jointly and severally, although on information and belief, Defendant MMV was the initiator.

15. Further, the intentional purpose of the subject mural was to inflict emotional distress on the Plaintiff. This reasonably and logically follows from the fact that the mural in no way contributed to electioneering or publicity for the Defendant's campaign. It was not even as an explicit denunciation of the Plaintiff, which would entail a rationale of

First Amendment protection under the United States Constitution and parallel provisions in the New York State and New York City law.

16. The mural did not call on anyone to vote for the Plaintiff. On the contrary, to the extent that people know who know that it was a project of and by the Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito, on information and belief, it would, be a "turn-off" in the community, counterproductive to her attracting votes.

17. Further, the subject building upon which the mural was commissioned by Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito and permitted by Defendant Eastside Managers' Associates, the building Owner and Plaintiff's Landlord, had been cut out of District 8, rendering the subject mural as removed from District 8 altogether.

18. Therefore, any electoral publicity function of the mural is clearly eliminated, and the sole remaining intent and purpose was to inflict emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

19. Furthermore, Defendant Eastside Managers' Associates, Inc., likewise had no other motive for "volunteering" its property for the mural, other than inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff: the Plaintiff was and is Landlord EMA's rent-stabilized tenant who has defeated said landlord in many

frivolous and vexatious court cases perpetrated against the Plaintiff by said Landlord (Defendant EMA), in addition to a years-long series of other acts of spite, nastiness, mischief and harassment by Defendant EMA, the Landlord against Plaintiff.

20. The frightening, scary, and perceived evil mural would not be a capital improvement to its building. The Landlord would certainly not be able to register the mural as an MCI.

21. On information and belief, the graffiti -like mural actually lowers the property value and put a downward pressure on prospective rents of apartments, the value of conversions, or sale price of the property.

22. Since the subject mural is counterproductive to the normal business prospects of the building Owner, Defendant EMA, it is reasonable to conclude that the motive of the Landlord Defendant EMA was to join in the mischief of Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito against the Plaintiff, causing the Plaintiff emotional distress, even overriding the detriment to the property value in order to do so.

23. Furthermore, principals of Eastside Managers' Associates, Inc., materially supported the campaign of the Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito against the Plaintiff.

24. Thus, a number of bases for the formation of a bond between both Defendants herein is evidenced, as a motivation for their joint and several collusion and collaboration in inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

25. The conduct of the Defendants, joint and several, has been extreme and outrageous, even against their seeming material interests, and was apparently committed with the sole intention of inflicting emotional distress upon the Plaintiff.

26. The Plaintiff did suffer from and sustain said emotional distress.

27. As a measure thereof, Plaintiff's performance in the above mentioned election was disrupted and Plaintiff's attention was distracted, along with other participants in Plaintiff's campaign. The resulting loss of energy from the campaign may even have affected the outcome of the Democratic Primary and consequently the contributed to the election of Defendant MMV to the City Council in Council District 8.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:  
RECKLESS INFLECTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

29. Jointly and severally, at the apparent initiative of Defendant MMV, the conduct of the Defendants jointly and severally has been extreme and outrageous, so as recklessly, to cause, and continue causing, foreseeable infliction of emotional distress, from which the Plaintiff has suffered.

30. On or about September 1, 2013, after several days of preliminary preparation, a mural (Exhibit A) appeared, painted on the eastern wall of the building located at and known as 152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street.

31. The mural took up most of the height of the wall, up to the top (5<sup>th</sup>) floor, where the apartment (5E) of the Plaintiff is located.

32. The mural abutted the bottom and north side of the east window of Plaintiff's apartment (#5E), and the corner formed by the intersection thereof.

33. The mural depicted a decapitated and wooden-sword-stabbed bird of prey, on information and belief, according to neighbors of Puerto Rican and other backgrounds, which they said in their culture constituted a curse and death threat, as a swastika or a noose would be felt by many Jews or African-Americans.

34. The subject mural, according to a *New York Daily News* article of September 4, 2013 (Exhibit B), was a result of substantial planning on the part of the Defendants, jointly and severally: As said Daily News article documents, "Months earlier, Eastside Managers Associates, which owns Goodwin's building at 152 E. 100th St., volunteered the walk-up's facade to Los Muros Hablan a multi-borough project spearheaded by Mark-Viverito and the El Museo del Barrio."

35. On information and belief, these reported facts establish that jointly and severally, the hired and funded creation of the subject mural was planned by the part of the Defendants, and foreseeably, they acted in an extreme and outrageous conduct, and recklessly inflicted emotional distress on the Plaintiff

36. Further, the foreseeable effect of the subject mural was to inflict emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

37. This reasonably and logically follows from the fact that the mural in no way contributed to electioneering or publicity for the Defendant's campaign, even as a denunciation of the Plaintiff, which would entail a rationale of First Amendment protection under the United States Constitution and parallel provisions in the New York State and New York City laws.

38. Further, the subject building upon which the mural was commissioned by Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito and permitted by Eastside Managers' Associates, the building owner and Plaintiff's landlord, is not even in District 8, and therefore has no part in the District 8 election.

39. Therefore, the Defendants do not have a reasonable resort to invoke the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution or related or parallel protections on the New York State or New York City levels.

40. Furthermore, Defendant Eastside Managers' Associates, Inc., likewise had no other motive for "volunteering" its property for the mural, so as to claim that this wrongful act was normal business activity, which only incidentally or accidentally resulted in inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff as a collateral casualty.

41. The frightening, scary, and perceived evil mural would not be a capital improvement to its building. The Landlord would certainly not be able to register the mural as a Major Capital Improvement to justify an increment to rents.

42. On information and belief, the graffiti -like mural would actually lower the property value and put a downward

pressure on prospective rents of apartments, the value of conversions, or sale price of the property.

43. Since the subject mural is counterproductive to the normal business prospects of the building owner, Defendant EMA, it is reasonable to conclude that the motive of the landlord Defendant EMA can not avail itself of a contention that in was normal business activity to join in the mischief of Melissa Mark-Viverito against the Plaintiff, causing the Plaintiff emotional distress, even overriding the detriment to the property value in order to do so, as an accidental result of rational business.

44. Furthermore, on information and belief, principals of Eastside Managers' Associates, Inc., materially supported the campaign of the Defendant Melissa Mark-Viverito against the Plaintiff, unleashing a vicious cycle of recklessness among both Defendants, EMA and MMV, jointly and severally.

45. Thus, a number of bases for the formation of a bond between both Defendants herein is evidenced, as a motivation for their joint and several collusion and collaboration in inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

46. The conduct of the Defendants, joint and several, has been extreme and outrageous, even against their seeming material interests, and therefore lacks a defense that their actions were committed in the normal course of business, thereby excusing their reckless acts.

47. The Plaintiff did suffer from and sustain said emotional distress.

48. As a result, Plaintiff's performance in the above mentioned election was disrupted and Plaintiff's attention was distracted, as was that of other participants in Plaintiff's campaign. The resulting loss of energy from the campaign may even have affected or reversed the outcome of the Democratic Primary and consequently the election to the City Council in Council District 8.

49. Meanwhile, Defendant MMV may unjustly be receiving a reward for her wrongful, tortious behavior, to the detriment and damage of the Plaintiff.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION  
CONSPIRACY IN WRONGFUL ACTS**

50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

51. Jointly and severally, at the apparent initiative of Defendant MMV, the conduct of the Defendants has been extreme and outrageous, recklessly, cause, and causing, intentional and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress, from which the Plaintiff has suffered.

52. The fact that as reported in the September 4, 2013, above-said *New York Daily News* (Exhibit B), "Months earlier, Eastside Managers Associates, which owns Goodwin's building at 152 E. 100th St., volunteered the walk-up's facade to Los Muros Hablan a multi-borough project spearheaded by Mark-Viverito and the El Museo del Barrio," indicates that the tortious and wrongful acts described above, the extreme and outrageous conduct engaged in and accomplished by the Defendants, resulting in the deliberate and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress by the Defendants on the Plaintiff, resulted from a conspiracy between the Defendants, compounding the civil wrongs committed by the Defendants taken separately.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION  
LARCENY**

53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

54. On information and belief, an artist told us that Defendant MMW asked said artist to remove a pro-Plaintiff Gwen Goodwin election campaign banner from Plaintiff's window, and called the landlord regarding this request, and a short time later, one of the landlord EMA principals, Jerry, was reported to direct one of the artists to remove Plaintiff's banner from Plaintiff's window, and the same Jerry was later seen to leave the scene rapidly, with the banner, as Police arrived. The banner has yet to be returned, and at any rate, after the election, it has little use value. Defendant EMA is further implicated because it made no attempt or approach to the Plaintiff to return the banner. On information and belief, Defendant MMV observed this theft and did nothing to reverse it or even report it, thereby making this illegal and wrongful act joint and several on the part of the Defendants, and another wrongful act committed by the Defendants, jointly and severally, which further contributed intentionally or recklessly to the infliction of emotional distress experienced by the Plaintiff.

55. This wrongful action also further contributed to the infliction of emotional distress, recklessly and/or intentionally, and as he is an agent, employee, servant, officer, and/or principal of the EMA landlord, his action contributes to the further liability of Defendant EMA and the

joint and several acts and omissions of both Defendants herein, on information and belief orchestrated by Defendant MMW.

56. Thus the Plaintiff was damaged both as to the material value and use value of the banner regarding Plaintiff's campaign.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:  
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH BUSINESS ACTIVITY**

57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

58. The above described wrongful behavior constitutes a tortious interference in the business activities of the Plaintiff, insofar as a political campaign is a type of business activity.

59. On information and belief, it is tantamount to unlawful actions designed to drive away potential customers away from a competitor in a commercial business.

60. The wrongful acts described above, intentional and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress, foreseeably disrupted, distracted and detracted from the relationship between the Plaintiff as candidate and the electorate, and Plaintiff's ability to appeal for votes for political office and

to challenge the incumbent Defendant MMV, and materially benefited the Defendant MMV, also foreseeably so.

61. Given the political conflict, there exists a motivation to disrupt and otherwise set back the efforts of rivals, and in this case, through the intentional and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress. The legitimate political conflict was carried out by wrongful means beyond the bounds of legitimacy and even legality, on information and belief, politics carried out by means of psychological warfare, which damaged the Plaintiff, and for which the Defendants, jointly and severally, should be held accountable and liable.

62. The Defendants were obviously conscious of Plaintiff's efforts to appeal to the electorate.

63. While the Plaintiff MMV of course had a right to use legitimate means to compete for reelection and defend her seat as the incumbent, she had no privilege to resort to wrongful activity, or any reason to believe that Defendant MMV had such a privilege to commit the civil wrongs of intentional and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress, in the course of electoral competition.

64. But instead, Defendant MMV is reaping the rewards of wrongful and tortious behavior, while the Plaintiff is damaged.

65. Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to consider equitable remedies may include some species of negative injunctive relief to balance against the rewards reaped by tortious behavior, namely, a seat on the City Council, and to discourage others from such temptations, in the absence of which, as a practical remedy, punitive damages may be the only possibility, should the Court so find.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION:  
WRONGFUL USE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS IN FURTHERANCE OF CIVIL WRONGS**

66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

67. On information and belief, Campaign funds, including matching funds, used directly or intermingled, by Defendant MMV, to finance what the above referenced September 4, 2013, Daily News article (Exhibit B) referenced above, described as a multiboro project spearheaded by Mark-Viverito and the El Museo del Barrio, would compound the Defendant MMV's tort liability, place the Plaintiff at an even greater disadvantage than what is normal between an incumbent and challenger, and would exponentially increase the capabilities of the Defendant MMV to

engage in wrongful conduct amounting to the tort of intentionally and/or recklessly inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:  
WRONGFUL USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS IN FURTHERANCE OF CIVIL WRONGS**

68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all foregoing paragraphs.

69. On information and belief, the above described project which the September 4, 2013 New York Daily News (Exhibit B) says Defendant MMV was "spearheading", Los Muros Hablan, is apparently a not-for-profit entity, which Defendant MMV was using directly or indirectly as a campaign asset, may be improper, would compound the Defendant MMV's tort liability, and would place the Plaintiff at an even greater disadvantage than what is normal between an incumbent and challenger, and would exponentially increase the capabilities of the Defendant MMV to engage in wrongful conduct amounting to the tort of intentionally and/or recklessly inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants in the amount of \$1 million dollars in combined compensatory and

punitive damages plus interest from September 1, 2013, to be apportioned among the Defendants as determined by the Court, plus costs and disbursements, together with whatever other, different, additional or further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

Dated: New York, New York  
December 30, 2013

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gwen Goodwin", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gwen Goodwin, pro se  
Plaintiff  
152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street  
(212) 534-0963

# VERIFICATION

State of New York, County of ~~Kings~~ <sup>New York</sup> ss:

The undersigned, an attorney duly admitted to practice in the courts of the State of New York,

certify that the within \_\_\_\_\_, has been compared by me with the original and found to be a true and complete copy.

state that I am the attorney for \_\_\_\_\_, and have read the foregoing . \_\_\_\_\_. The reason this verification is being made by me and not by the \_\_\_\_\_, is that:

\_\_\_\_\_.

I, the undersigned, being duly sworn, depose and say: I am the Plaintiff in the within action.

I, the undersigned, am the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, a [domestic] corporation, and a party to the within action; this verification is made by me because the above party is a corporation and I am an officer thereof.

**I have read the foregoing Complaint, and know the contents thereof; the same is true to my own knowledge, except as to matters therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.**

Gwen Goodwin  
Gwen Goodwin, pro se

Signed and sworn to before me,  
this 30<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

/S/ Margaret A. Schwartz  
/P/ MARGARET A. SCHWARTZ

License No. \_\_\_\_\_  
/Commission Expiry \_\_\_\_\_

MARGARET A. SCHWARTZ  
Notary Public, State of New York  
Reg. No. 015C6152068  
Qualified in New York County  
Commission Expires Aug. 23, 2014

**Proof of Service:** STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK) ss:

The Undersigned, being duly sworn, deposes and says: deponent is not a party herein, is over 18 years of age and resides in the State of New York. On \_\_\_\_\_, deponent served the within \_\_\_\_\_, on \_\_\_\_\_, therein named.

(individual) by delivering a true copy of each to said \_\_\_\_\_ personally; deponent knew the person so served to be the person described as said \_\_\_\_\_ therein, and conforming to the descriptive attributes below.  
 (corporation) by delivering a true copy of each to \_\_\_\_\_ through an individual agent, employee or servant thereof, deponent knew said corporation so served to be the corporation described in said \_\_\_\_\_ and knew or observed said individual, conforming to the descriptive attributes below, to be \_\_\_\_\_ thereof.  
 (suitable person) by delivering at the [  residence, [  actual place of business or place of business, or [  usual abode within the State of New York, a true copy of each to \_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion, and conforming to the descriptive attributes below.

**DESCRIPTIVE ATTRIBUTES:** Sex \_\_\_\_\_, Skin Color \_\_\_\_\_, Eye Color \_\_\_\_\_, Hair Color \_\_\_\_\_, Hair Texture \_\_\_\_\_, Age \_\_\_\_\_, Height \_\_\_\_\_, Weight \_\_\_\_\_, Glasses \_\_\_\_\_, Attire \_\_\_\_\_, Other \_\_\_\_\_.

affixation, etc.) by affixing a true copy of each to the door of premises, which is \_\_\_\_\_'s [  residence, [  actual place of business, or [  usual abode within the State. Deponent was unable, with due diligence, to find \_\_\_\_\_, or a person of suitable age or discretion thereat, having called there, and within twenty (20) days of such delivery or affixation, deponent enclosed a true copy of same in a postpaid envelope, bearing the legend "Personal and Confidential", and not on the outside thereof indicating by return address or otherwise that the communication was from an attorney or concerned an adversary action involving \_\_\_\_\_, properly addressed to that person's [  last known residence, [  actual place of business, or [  usual abode within the State, and deposited said envelope in an official depository under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Postal Service within New York State.

(service by mail) by mailing a true copy of each to the person at the person's last known address as set forth below at the bottom of the right-hand column on this page.

(service by electronic means) by transmitting a true copy of each to the person by [  FAX through the telephone number indicated, [  by EMAIL at the EMAIL address indicated, as set forth with the name of said person, and by mailing a true copy of each to the address, set forth below, at the bottom of the right-hand column of this page.

(overnight delivery service) by delivering a true copy of each by overnight delivery to the person at the person's last known address, as set forth below at the bottom of the right-hand column of this page.

Signed and sworn to before me  
 this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011

/S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
 /P/ \_\_\_\_\_  
 License No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Commission Expiry Date \_\_\_\_\_

/S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
 /P/ \_\_\_\_\_

14100003

Index No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Supreme Court of the State of New York  
 County of New York

GWEN GOODWIN,

Plaintiff,

-v-

MELISSA MARK-VIVERITO, and  
 EASTSIDE MANAGERS'  
 ASSOCIATES, INC.

Defendants.

Summons and Complaint

*Pursuant to 22 NYCRR 130-1.1, the undersigned, an attorney duly admitted to practice in the courts of the State of New York, certifies that, upon information and belief and reasonable inquiry, the contentions contained in the annexed document are not frivolous.*

GWEN GOODWIN, pro se  
 Plaintiff

152 East 100<sup>th</sup> Street  
 New York, NY 10029  
 212-534-0963

MELISSA MARK-VIVERITO  
 Defendant

112 East 111 St. NYC 10029  
 250 Broadway, NYC 10007  
 105 East 116<sup>th</sup> Street, NYC 10029

EASTSIDE MGRS' ASSOCS, Inc.  
 Defendant  
 234 East 121<sup>st</sup> St., NYC 10035

Service is Hereby Admitted:

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_  
 /S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
 /P/ \_\_\_\_\_