

# Appendix A State of New York Court of Appeals

Decided and Entered on the tenth day of February, 2022

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

Mo. No. 2021-808 In the Matter of Jimmy Baldea, &c., Appellant,

v.

City of New York License Division of the NYPD, Respondent.

Appellant having moved for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals in the above cause;

Upon the papers filed and due deliberations, it is ORDERED, that the motion is denied.

[SEAL]
/s/ John P. Asiello
John P. Asiello
Clerk of the Court

#### Appendix B

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

Index No. 101128/19

Jimmy Baldea, American Resources & Strategies Inc.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

-against-

CITY OF NEW YORK LICENSE DIVISION OF THE NYPD,

Defendant-Respondent.

#### NOTICE OF ENTRY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the attached is a true copy of the order of the Appellate Division, First Department in this matter which was entered in the Clerk's Office on the 19th day of August 2021.

Dated: New York, New York September 15, 2021 /s/ Jimmy Baldea
Jimmy Baldea,
29-05 160th Street
Flushing, New York 11358
Business Phone: (212) 300-5126
Email Jimmy@Baldea.com
Pro-Se Plaintiff-Appellant

TO:
Tahirih Sadreih, Esq.
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York
Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007
Phone (212) 356-3191
Email TSadrieh@law.nyc.gov

#### Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division, First Judicial Department

Present – Hon. Barbara R. Kapnick, Justice Presiding, Angela M Mazzarelli Peter H. Moulton Manuel J. Mendez, Justices.

> Motion No. **2021-02170** Index No. 101128/2019 Case No. 202-01177

In the Matter of Jimmy Baldea, American Resources & Strategies Inc., Petitioner-Appellant,

-against-

City of New York License Division of the NYPD, Respondent-Respondent.

Petitioner-appellant having moved, pro-se, for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals from the decision and order of this Court, entered on May 27, 2021 (Appeal No. 13933N),

Now, upon reading and filing the papers with respect to the motion, and due deliberation having been had thereon,

It is ordered that the motion is denied.

ENTERED: August 19, 2021

/s/ Susanna Molina Rojas Susanna Molina Rojas Clerk of the Court

#### [LOGO] RECORD PRESS

Appellate Management Document Solutions 229 West 36th Street, 8th Fl., New York, NY 10018 212-619-4949 ● www.recordpress.com

#### [88505]

STATE OF NEW YORK )
COUNTY OF NEW YORK ) SS:

#### AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

Edward Gutowski, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am not a party to the action, and I am over 18 years of age.

On the 16th day of September 2021, I served 1 true copy of the within

#### **Notice of Entry**

upon the attorneys at the addresses indicated below, by the following method(s):

Contact	Address + Email Address	Delivery Method
the City of New York	100 Church Street New York, New York 10007 (212) 356-3191	FedEx Next Business Day
Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent	tsadrieh@ law.nyc.gov	

/s/ Edward Gutowski

Case Name: Baldea v. City of New York License Division

Index Number: 101128/19

#### /s/ Nadia Oswald-Hamid

Sworn to me this: September 16, 2021

Nadia R. Oswald-Hamid Notary Public, State of New York No. 010S6101366 Qualified in Kings Commission Expires November 10, 2023

### Appendix C

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

PRESENT:Edmead	DADT 25
	<del></del>
IN	<b>DEX NUMBER:</b> <u>101128/2019</u>
	<b>MOTION DATE:</b> <u>11/26/19</u>
	MOTION SEQ. NO1_
Index Number: 101128/BALDEA, JIMMY, AMIVS. CITY OF NY LICENSE Sequence Number: 001	ERICAN
ARTICLE 78	
•	STAMP] ECEIVED
NO	V 27, 2019
	ME COURT – CIVIL CLERK'S OFFICE
The following papers read on this motion to	s, numbered 1 to, were
	rder to Show Cause —   No(s)
Answering Affidavits	— Exhibits   No(s)
Replying Affidavits _	No(s)
	papers, it is ordered that

In accordance with the "So-Ordered" transcript November 26, 2019 [K. Jones, Sr. Ct. Rptr.], oral argument, and a review of the complete submissions, it is hereby

ORDERED that the application by Petitioner pursuant to Article 78 seeking to vacate Respondent's determination denying Petitioner's renewal application for an Unrestricted Business Carry License is denied. Respondent rationally found that Petitioner did not demonstrate proper cause for renewal as he did not demonstrate, as required under 38 RCNY 5-03, that by reason of his employment or business, he is exposed to extraordinary personal danger and/or proof of recurrent threats to life or safety. He also failed to demonstrate a special need for self-protection that distinguished him from others in the community. Respondent's decision was thus a reasonable exercise of discretion and is not subject to judicial intervention. It is further

ORDERED that the application is denied and the petition is dismissed with prejudice.

[STAMP] FILED

NOV 27, 2019

NEW YORK COUNTY COUNTY CLERK

Dated: 11/26/2019

/s/ Carol R. Edmead , J.S.C. HON. CAROL R. EDMEAD, J.S.C.

	OTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY REFERRED D JUSTICE
F	OR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):
1.	CHECK ONE
	☑ CASE DISPOSED
	□ NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
2.	CHECK AS APPROPRIATE: MOTION IS:
	☐ GRANTED ☐ DENIED
	$\square$ GRANTED IN PART $\square$ OTHER
3.	CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:
	☐ SETTLE ORDER ☐ SUBMIT ORDER
	□ DO NOT POST
	☐ FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT
	□ REFERENCE

#### 11a

#### Appendix D

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

Index No. 101128/19 Case No. 2020-01177

Kapnick, J.P., Mazzarelli, Moulton, Mendez, JJ. 139933N

In the Matter of Jimmy BALDEA, AMERICAN RESOURCES & STRATEGIES INC.,

Petitioner-Appellant,

-against-

CITY OF NEW YORK LICENSE DIVISION OF THE NYPD,

Respondent-Respondent.

Jimmy Baldea, appellant pro se.

James E. Johnson, Corporation Counsel, New York (Tahirih M. Sadrieh of counsel), for respondent.

Judgment (denominated an order), Supreme Court, New York County (Carol R. Edmead, J.), entered November 27, 2019, denying the petition to annul the determination of respondent City of New York Police Department License Division, dated May 8, 2019, which denied petitioner's renewal application for an unrestricted business carry license, and dismissing the proceeding brought pursuant to CPLR article 78, unanimously affirmed, without costs.

The court properly determined that the denial of petitioner's renewal application was not arbitrary and capricious. Respondent rationally concluded that petitioner's application did not establish "proper cause" within the meaning of Penal Law § 400.00, in the absence of documentation substantiating threats to petitioner personally (see 38 RCNY 5-03; Matter of Martinek v Kerik, 294 AD2d 221, 221-222 [1st Dept 2002], lv denied 98 NY2d 613 [2002]).

We have considered petitioner's remaining arguments and find them unavailing.

THIS CONSTITUTES THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT.

ENTERED: May 27, 2021

/s/ Susanna Molina Rojas Susanna Molina Rojas Clerk of the Court