

No. 21-1495

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

JIMMY BALDEA,

Petitioner,

—v.—

CITY OF NEW YORK LICENSE DIVISION OF THE NYPD,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

REPLY TO OPPOSITION

JIMMY BALDEA
2905 160th Street
Flushing, New York 11358
(212) 300-5126
jimmy@baldea.com

Pro-Se Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
ARGUMENT	2
I. Respondent failed to reveal exculpatory truths in their Brief in Opposition	2
II. Revised New York State and New York City concealed carry licensing processes still do not address Petitioner’s in-residency/out-of-state police employment issues as explained in the Petition.....	4
III. Certiorari review is warranted in this case	5
CONCLUSION	6
APPENDIX A – Petitioner First Informed Respondent of Becoming a Police Officer	1a
APPENDIX B – Additional Efforts to Inform Respondent that Petitioner is a Police Officer	3a
APPENDIX C – Post Retirement of Jonathan David.....	6a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE(S)
Cases	
<i>Antonyuk v. Hochul</i> , No. 1:22-CV-0986 (N.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2022).....	4
<i>Hardaway v. Nigrelli</i> , 22-CV-771 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 20, 2022).....	4
<i>N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n, et al. v.</i> <i>City of N.Y., et al.</i> , 140 S.Ct. 1525 (2020)	1
<i>N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n v. Bruen</i> , 142 S.Ct. 2111 (2022)	1
<i>District of Columbia, et al. v. Dick Anthony Heller</i> , 544 U.S. 570 (2008)	1
Rules	
Supreme Court Rule 29	4
Constitutional Provisions	
Amendment II, U.S. Constitution	1
Other Authorities	
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Fair and Impartial Policing	3

REPLY BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER

This Court should grant certiorari in this case for two reasons: Respondent failed to reveal exculpatory truths in their Brief in Opposition, and revised New York State and New York City concealed carry licensing processes still do not address Petitioner's in-residency/out-of-state police employment issues as explained in the Petition.

Contrary to Respondent's assertion, Respondent excluded Petitioner's out-of-court resolution attempts¹ in its Brief in Opposition. This reveals that Respondent continues to misuse its broad discretionary powers, in bad faith, in a manner that violates the Second Amendment, *District of Columbia, et al. v. Dick Anthony Heller*, 544 U.S. 570 (2008), LEOSA, and *N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, 142 S.Ct. 2111 (2022). Furthermore, Respondent's position regarding change in circumstances teeter for its own benefit, proclaiming it as valid reasoning to exit² from its own Supreme Court litigation while lynching Petitioner for his evocation of the same. Respondent continues to violate fundamental principles of statutory interpretation without regard.

Moreover, Petitioner's matter is unique because parts of it may not be interpreted to fall under the jurisdiction of Bruen because it deals with cross-border residency and employment of a law enforcement officer and identifies a LEOSA violation of the laws of the State and of the City. Because such a unique matter is not on the radar to be legislatively resolved immediately, if at all, by the State and/or City,

¹ www.baldea.com/J1.mp4

² *N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, et al. v. City of N.Y., et al.*, 140 S Ct. 1525 (2020)

Petitioner remains at risk in the interim, all while continuing to arrest suspects of drug trafficking and violent crimes, several of whom have a history of travel to/from New York and other neighboring states. This dispute remains alive, and the controversy continues to exist.

This case is the appropriate vehicle for addressing these important questions. The Court should grant certiorari.

ARGUMENT

I. Respondent failed to reveal exculpatory truths in their Brief in Opposition

Respondent's Brief in Opposition contains language that may mislead the Court in its attempt to establish elements needed to intervene in this matter. Brief in Opposition author, attorney Tahirih Sadrieh, was first informed of Petitioner's change in circumstances on October 29, 2020³. Petitioner, due to Sadrieh's delays and inaction, then alerted 1 Police Plaza on June 4, 2021⁴. Petitioner then informed all lower courts starting with the Appellate Division, First Department, as noted in the record before the Court. Recorded audio/video evidence, presently hosted on the Internet⁵, directly contradicts statements within Respondent's Brief in Opposition. Baldea shared this evidence with Respondent on several occasions⁶. It is reasonable to expect a police agency

³ Appendix A, first notification

⁴ Appendix B, notification to Jonathan David, NYPD License Division senior official and attorney

⁵ www.baldea.com/J2.mp4

⁶ Appendix C, noting email exchange with Jonathan David's successor, Nicole Berkovich

to investigate an applicant's claim of being a police officer. Petitioner cites that Respondent's historic substandard investigation practices paved a pathway that allowed Respondent to cancel, discount, and/or distort truths. Respondent's investigative failures and denial/suppression of Petitioner's self-identification are not in accordance with how a reasonable pistol licensing investigator would act. Respondent's unreasonable partiality during its investigations was not in accordance with IACP standards; the License Division of the NYPD was not critically fair nor equitable⁷. This yielded evasive and unalienable violations to Petitioner's rights. The lower courts' codifications of these violations continue to endanger the safety of the Petitioner whilst in the performance of police enforcement and also whilst serving as a police officer. Baldea has not filed a new application with the NYPD because NYPD License Division senior official and attorney Jonathan David agreed to a resolution to reinstate Baldea's 2018-21 carry in order to remove the "Scarlet Letter" NYPD disapproval, then retired prior to fulfilling his promise. The post-*Bruen* reconsideration application and no-fee relief specified by Respondent is not applicable to Baldea. Lastly, this matter would never have reached lower courts if Respondent investigated and addressed this matter in a manner that is in accordance with an unbiased and uncharged decision-maker, and would never have reached this Court if Respondent acted in Good Faith after learning of Petitioner's change in circumstances and continued to litigate rather than resolve without regard to the totality of the circumstances of this specific case. This

⁷ IACP: <https://www.policchiefmagazine.org/the-mastle-obtaining-legitimacy-through-fair-impartial-and-objective-decision-making/>

Court should grant certiorari to address these omissions.

II. Revised New York State and New York City concealed carry licensing processes still do not address Petitioner's in-residency/out-of-state police employment issues as explained in the Petition

New York State and New York City concealed carry licensing processes are premature, incomplete, and presently contain provisions⁸ that have been flagged by Courts for their failure to address important federal issues of statutory interpretation and constitutional law. New York State and to New York City have infused language within recent legislation⁹ that is subversive to *Bruen* and has resulted in continued circumvention. New York State and New York City have not yet authored, however are required to modify existing or create new laws to become *Bruen*-compliant. *Bruen*, alone, will not address Petitioner's issues as explained in the Petition. Jonathan David, with the Power of Authority, admitted that he was open to making a reasonable solution work; because his successor, Nicole Berkovich, does not share his openness for resolution, Petitioner's dispute remains alive, and this Court should grant certiorari to address matters that cannot otherwise be resolved due to dissident voids in existing laws.

As an aside, Respondent alleges improper service, citing this Court's Rule 29, however this Court did not raise an issue to Petitioner's service, and directed

⁸ *Antonyuk v. Hochul*, No. 1:22-CV-0986, N.D.N.Y. (2022)

⁹ *Hardaway v. Nigrelli*, 22-CV-771 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 20, 2022)

Respondent to file a response. Respondent has received an extension and has since filed its response. The petition is moving along, Petitioner asks this Court to grant certiorari because there has been no adverse impact suffered as a result of original service by either party.

III. Certiorari review is warranted in this case

This case is an ideal vehicle for upholding inalienable rights, and for affirming checks and balances for municipal, agency, and divisional overreaches of power. Respondents argue against a grant of certiorari, asserting that formats were not followed, the need does not exist, and that federal law does not come into question; Respondent would rather have Officer Baldea file a new application, than to eliminate the scar that Respondent caused to Petitioner's personal record by disapproving the renewal of his previous application. This is unjust.

Petitioner has volunteered in New York City and in New York State since 1993. Petitioner served the needs of law enforcement officers since 2014, then became recognized for his work. Petitioner continually provided Respondent with examples of escalations of his work. Petitioner then became a law enforcement officer, and continued to achieve work-related accomplishments. Petitioner became an elected police fraternal leader, then was chosen to serve on an elite national police consortium¹⁰, and now has his name and work showcased in a monument¹¹ in our Nation's

¹⁰ Fourth profile: <https://nij.ojp.gov/funding/leads-scholar-biographies>

¹¹ <https://nleomf.org/dz-award/los-angeles-ca-police-department-and-police-protective-league-2022-comprehensive-wellness-winner/>

Capital. This is the character of the person the NYPD is litigating against. Respondent charged Petitioner an expensive \$340.00 application fee then failed to perform the proper investigation specified as part of the fee. When Petitioner subsequently faced a loss of rights due to the arbitrary and capricious rulings of Respondent and lower courts, Petitioner arose solo to challenge the injustices he experienced via litigation. Petitioner seeks to fix the broken system of his municipality of residence. The interests of justice would be served if this Court addresses the indiscretions of Respondent and corrects the lower courts' interpretations and decisions.

CONCLUSION

The petition for certiorari should be granted.

November 10, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Jimmy Baldea
2905 160th Street
Flushing, NY 11358
(212) 300-5126
Jimmy@Baldea.com

Pro Se Petitioner

APPENDIX

1a

Appendix A

Petitioner First Informed Respondent
of Becoming a Police Officer

From: "Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)" <tsadrieh@law.nyc.gov>
Date: October 29, 2020 at 13:32:41 EDT
To: "Jimmy@Baldea.com" <Jimmy@baldea.com>
Subject: RE: Jimmy Baldea v. NYPD License Division

Sure.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com [<mailto:Jimmy@Baldea.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)
Subject: Re: Jimmy Baldea v. NYPD License Division

May I answer you tomorrow? I just got OC sprayed as part of my police training.

Regards,
Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126
Text: (212) 300-5126
Fax: (212) 658-9961
Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

On Oct 29, 2020, at 12:24 PM, Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law) <tsadrieh@law.nyc.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Baldea:

Would you consent to an adjournment of this case to the January 2013 Term of the Court? Following an adjournment, the City's brief would be due on

2a

December 9 and your reply would be due on December 18.

Please let me know. Thank you.

--Tahirih Sadrieh
Assistant Corporation Counsel

-----Original Message-----

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com [mailto:Jimmy@Baldea.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2020 11:39 AM

To: Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)

Subject: Jimmy Baldea

Hello,

You reached out to me several months ago. You took over as Counsel for the Appellate First Department case for Supreme Court NY 101128/209. I just wanted you to know that Record Press electronically filed/ submitted my Brief, Appendix, Note of Issue, etc., on the NYSCEF system.

Thank you. Have a nice day.

Regards,

Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Appendix B

Additional Efforts to Inform Respondent
that Petitioner is a Police Officer

From: "Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)" <tsadrieh@law.nyc.gov>
Date: June 4, 2021 at 14:47:28 EDT
To: jimmy@baldea.com
Subject: RE: Correct number for Jonathan David

You're welcome. You too.

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com [<mailto:Jimmy@Baldea.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2021 2:33 PM
To: Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)
Subject: Re: Correct number for Jonathan David

Thank you. I appreciate it. Have a nice weekend.

On Jun 4, 2021, at 14:29, Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law) <tsadrieh@law.nyc.gov> wrote:

My apologies. The correct number is (929) 291-1945.

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com [<mailto:Jimmy@Baldea.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:33 AM
To: Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)
Subject: Correct number for Jonathan David

Good morning, Ms. Sadrieh:

When you emailed me Mr. Jonathan David's phone number, 1 digit was missing. Would you please provide me his correct contact information? Thank you, in advance.

Regards,

Deputy Sheriff Jimmy Baldea, EMT-B

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126
Fax: (212) 658-9961
Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

On Jun 1, 2021, at 12:51, Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law) <tsadrieh@law.nyc.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Baldea,

To resolve the current status of your firearms, you should contact Jonathan David at the License Division of the New York City Police Department, cc'd here. You may also contact him by telephone at 929 29 1945.

--Tahirih Sadrieh
Assistant Corporation Counsel

From: JB@AmericanEHealth.com
[<mailto:JB@americanehealth.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 12:07 PM
To: Sadrieh, Tahirih (Law)
Cc: Emma Holmes; Kam Yuen; Raceel Pascall;
Joseph Reekie; Reinaldo Rivera; Augustine Rivera;
Daniel Ramos
Subject: Re: Baldea v NYC License Division

Dear Ms. Sadreih:

I received word that you won this case. I am still a police officer, I was issued a duty pistol by my employing agency, I still live in NYC (Queens), and my firearms are still in the possession of a licensed gun shop. The shop requires NYPD licensing in order to return my firearms to me. You previously stated that you were open to addressing this matter. What can be done to resolve this matter?

5a

Regards,

Deputy Sheriff Jimmy Baldea, EMT-B

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

Appendix C

Post Retirement of Jonathan David

From: "BERKOVICH, NICOLE"
<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org>
Date: May 4, 2022 at 15:26:18 EDT
To: jimmy@baldea.com
Subject: Re: Following up on Enclosed Recordings of Jonathan David - Re: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, 2012112326, TIME SENSITIVE

Mr. Baldea,

To be clear, this request is being reviewed as a matter of courtesy. The License Division has no duty to issue you a license. As previously mentioned, you applied for a license and your disapproval has already been upheld by the court. While I appreciate whatever VENDEX concerns you may have, they were not persuasive to a reviewing court during your Article 78 and will not sway my decision now. Whether you chose to be represented by an attorney in this matter previously is irrelevant. If you believe that you have legitimate grounds to make a new claim and your timeframe to do so is about to expire I encourage you to file said claim so that you do not lose out on whatever potential redress you may be entitled to. Whether you choose to engage an attorney in this matter moving forward is your prerogative. It is the policy of the License Division to treat all applicants and licensees fairly regardless of their legal representation status.

I have reviewed the videos that you sent. No where in either of the recordings is a promise to issue you a

Unrestricted Carry license, on either a temporary or permanent basis. While former Director David does promise you that he will look into it, no final decision was made by Mr. David. At best, he says: "I mean it's a little unconventional to activate a license for that purpose and then de-activate it, but what the heck, I think I can do it and I think it probably makes sense to do that for you here." However, even this statement is surrounded by equivocations and conditions. During this call Mr. David stated that he needed to run this past other people and also wanted to follow-up with your employer in Vermont. There are no notes to indicate the results of any such follow-up. Ultimately, Mr. David ultimately did not issue you the license.

At this point, the decision is left to me. I will not approve issuing you a Carry license on either a temporary or permanent basis given the facts before me. The License Division and a reviewing Court has found that you do not qualify for a Carry License. A decision to the contrary by me at this point would circumvent an established application process which is subject to formal review by the New York Supreme Court, this type of circumvention of procedure is inappropriate. Furthermore, there is no provision in the law for the issuance of a temporary license for your stated purpose.

However, if the issue is the ability to pick the firearms up from the FFL in Long Island, a Premise Residence License will suffice for that purpose. Based upon your representations it appears that you do still maintain NYC residency sufficient to qualify for a Premise Residence license. If you want a Premise Residence license the License Division will process your application expeditiously once you complete it and submit all relevant documentation. I would ask

that if this is the route you decide to take that you please let me know **no later than 5pm on May 13, 2022**. I am happy to ensure that you receive assistance in completing the application if you require it. The License Division expects an influx of work later this summer and I want to make sure that your application would be scheduled to be dealt with timely prior to that.

Alternatively, you may have better luck receiving a Carry License from NYC after the Supreme Court issues a decision in the *Bruen* case that is currently pending before it. If you wish to reapply for a Carry license under whatever new guidelines arise out of that case you are of course welcome to do so, though you should expect extended processing times due to an anticipated influx of applications at that time.

Sincerely,

Nicole Berkovich
Director, License Division
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza, Room 110A
New York, NY 10038
Office: (646) 610-6485
nicole.berkovich@nypd.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain CONFIDENTIAL and PRIVILEGED information for the use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, use, disclosure or distribution of it or its contents is prohibited and may violate laws including the *Electronic Communications Privacy Act*. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact

9a

the sender and destroy all copies of this communication.

Please treat this and all other communications from the New York City Police Department as **LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE / FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**.

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com <Jimmy@baldea.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:10 PM

To: jimmy@baldea.com <jimmy@baldea.com>

Cc: BERKOVICH; NICOLE

<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org>

Subject: Following up on Enclosed Recordings of Jonathan David - Re: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, 2012112326, TIME SENSITIVE

Dear Ms. Berkovich:

I wanted to follow up to make sure that you received the package. Per the USPS Tracking photo enclosed, it was delivered on May 3, 2022 at 9:30 am. It should be noted that "Time Sensitive" was written on the sent package.

To expedite your access to its contents, I posted 2 links several days ago via email. Please review these items. I thank you, in advance, for your prompt attention and review.

Regards,

Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

10a

On May 2, 2022, at 10:18, jimmy@baldea.com wrote:

RE: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, Unrestricted Business Carry License #2012112326

Link to one video: www.baldea.com/J1.mp4

Link to another video: www.baldea.com/J2.mp4

Dear Ms. Berkovich:

Please review the two links above. Separately, per your instructions, I also mailed a USB memory stick that contains recordings of bona fide offer and acceptance discussions with your predecessor, for the temporary reinstatement of my Unrestricted Business Carry License #2012112326. This solution works best because it eliminates liabilities on your end, and also fully resolves my VENDEX concerns and separately enables me to re-take possession of my handguns which are currently stored with my Long Island based FFL.

I am requesting that you expedite your review of this matter. I, with a heavy heart, have litigated this matter specifically to prevent professional harm to myself (referring to VENDEX). Your predecessor appreciated that I have never hired an attorney for representation on this matter. Respectfully, I am approaching a filing deadline and seek to address this, within the next day or 2, in order to avoid having to file further legal actions in Higher Court.

Would you please review these videos and help me to resolve this matter so that we may both move on?

Regards,

Officer Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

11a

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

On Apr 29, 2022, at 15:50, BERKOVICH, NICOLE
<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org> wrote:

I think a thumb drive would likely work best, unless you can zip them down and just attach them via email.

Sincerely,

Nicole Berkovich
Director, License Division
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza, Room 110A
New York, NY 10038
Office: (646) 610-6485
nicole.berkovich@nypd.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain CONFIDENTIAL and PRIVILEGED information for the use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, use, disclosure or distribution of it or its contents is prohibited and may violate laws including the *Electronic Communications Privacy Act*. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this communication.

Please treat this and all other communications from the New York City Police Department as **LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE / FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**.

12a

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com <Jimmy@baldea.com>

Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 3:31 PM

To: BERKOVICH, NICOLE

<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org>

Subject: Re: Recordings of Jonathan David - Re: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, 2012112326

How would you prefer to accept the videos? Do you want me to burn them onto DVD's, mail you a thumb drive, host them and send you a link? Sincerely, he made very specific statements, and all I want is to resolve this. Please be open to doing what's morally, ethically, and professionally right. Again, what manner would you like to receive the files?

Regards,

Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

On Apr 29, 2022, at 14:37, BERKOVICH, NICOLE <NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org> wrote:

You are welcome to send over what you have for my review.

Sincerely,

Nicole Berkovich

Director, License Division

New York City Police Department

One Police Plaza, Room 110A

New York, NY 10038

Office: (646) 610-6485

nicole.berkovich@nypd.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain CONFIDENTIAL and PRIVILEGED information for the use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, use, disclosure or distribution of it or its contents is prohibited and may violate laws including the *Electronic Communications Privacy Act*. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this communication.

Please treat this and all other communications from the New York City Police Department as **LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE / FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**.

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com <Jimmy@baldea.com>
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 1:12 PM
To: BERKOVICH, NICOLE
<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org>
Subject: Recordings of Jonathan David - Re: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, 2012112326

You don't often get email from jimmy@baldea.com . Learn why this is important

Dear Ms. Berkovich:

OK, great. I recorded the conversations with Jonathan David. Being that I have proof, I want you to hear his words for yourself. How do we proceed ASAP? I'm on a time delay, and seek to resolve this immediately.

Regards,

Jimmy Baldea

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

On Apr 29, 2022, at 11:40, BERKOVICH, NICOLE
<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org> wrote:

Good Morning Mr. Baldea,

Thank you for following up on our previous phone call. I have had the opportunity to look into your matter and after review have determined that granting you a temporary Carry License would be inappropriate. You had applied for and were denied a Carry License and had the opportunity to appeal said denial via an Article 78 proceeding, after which the denial of the license was upheld. Given the situation, as well as your explanation that you currently reside within the bounds of NYC, the most appropriate course of action here would be for you to apply for a license type for which you would likely qualify, for example, a Premise Residence license.

I understand that you have spoken to the previous Director, Mr. David, regarding your request. Over the phone you stated to me that you and he came to a "gentleman's agreement". I see no indication in any of our files that Mr. David promised you a temporary license. A review of the entirety of your file indicated that you and Mr. David spoke, and that he was considering your request, but ultimately, I see no evidence that a final decision was made. If you have evidence to the contrary please let me know.

15a

I understand that this decision is likely not the answer that you were hoping for, however, you are not without options. As I mentioned previously, you may have the dealer who is currently storing your firearms ship them to another FFL in a state/county where you may lawfully pick them up. You can apply for a different license type with the NYPD, or in another location, and of course you are always free to contract with the FFL to sell your firearms if you no longer want them.

I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Nicole Berkovich
Director, License Division
New York City Police Department
One Police Plaza, Room 110A
New York, NY 10038
Office: (646) 610-6485
nicole.berkovich@nypd.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain **CONFIDENTIAL** and **PRIVILEGED** information for the use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, use, disclosure or distribution of it or its contents is prohibited and may violate laws including the *Electronic Communications Privacy Act*. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this communication.

Please treat this and all other communications from the New York City Police Department as **LAW**

**ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE / FOR OFFICIAL
USE ONLY.**

From: Jimmy@Baldea.com <Jimmy@baldea.com>
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 3:03 AM
To: BERKOVICH, NICOLE
<NICOLE.BERKOVICH@nypd.org>
Subject: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, 2012112326

You don't often get email from jimmy@baldea.com . Learn why this is important

CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER

STOP WHEN UNSURE. Never click on links or open attachments if sender is unknown, and never provide user ID or password. Suspicious? Please report to this email address: reportphishing@nypd.org

Good morning:

We spoke via telephone 2 weeks ago regarding a possible resolution to my issues (see forwarded email below). You asked me to contact you today if I had not heard from you by today. I celebrate the Greek Good Friday today and will be unable to call you today. I will contact you on Monday. Thank you, in advance, for your consideration and professional courtesy.

Regards,

Officer Jimmy Baldea

.....

Tel: (212) 300-5126

Text: (212) 300-5126

17a

Fax: (212) 658-9961

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: JimmyBaldea@aol.com

Date: March 30, 2022 at 10:48:02 EDT

To: jimmy@baldea.com

Subject: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea

Reply-To: jimmybaldea@aol.com

Jimmy Baldea
2905 160th Street
Flushing, NY 11358
March 30, 2022

NYPD License Division
1 Police Plaza, Room 110A, New York, NY 10038
Attention: Hugh Bogle, Nicole Berkovich

RE: Police Officer Jimmy Baldea, Business Carry
License #2012112326

Dear NYPD License Division Leaders:

I am a police officer, and am requesting your intervention. I vouchered my 3 handguns with a Long Island FFL during a denial/appeal process when I attempted to renew my 2018/21 Unrestricted Business Carry License #2012112326. These 3 handguns have been incurring storage fees since this time. Jonathan David had attempted to assist me recover my firearms and eliminate my VENDEX concerns by temporarily reinstating my license. I agreed to Jonathan David's proposed solution, then he abruptly stopped communicating with me. Today, I learned of his retirement, and I request a meeting with you to arrive at a resolution.

Respectfully,

Police Officer Jimmy Baldea

Email: Jimmy@Baldea.com

Mobile: (212) 300-5126

- Active Sworn Law Enforcement Officer
- Police Health Researcher[1]
- Police Wellness Pioneer[2]
- Local FOP Board Secretary
- 2022 National Award Candidate

[1] Three IACP speeches; 1 testimony before the Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement & the Administration of Justice; 1 speech before the Harvard Law School Police Union Leadership Seminar; 1 testimony before the American Medical Association; 1 testimony before the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; numerous publications.

[2] www.lapd.com/members/jimmy-baldea

<1PP_03-30-2022.pdf>