

E.D.N.Y. – C. Islip  
23-cv-6507  
Azrack, J.  
Shields, M.J.

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE  
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, two thousand twenty-four.

Present:

José A. Cabranes,  
Richard C. Wesley,  
Alison J. Nathan,  
*Circuit Judges.*

---

Lidia M. Orrego,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

v.

23-7928

Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP,  
Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, First Choice  
Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder, MD,

*Defendants-Appellees,*


John Doe, Jane Doe,

*Defendants.*

---

This Court has sua sponte determined that it lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the district court has not issued a final order as contemplated by 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *See Petrello v. White*, 533 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2008). Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the appeal is DISMISSED.

FOR THE COURT:  
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

  
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

APPENDIX A

1a

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE  
SECOND CIRCUIT**

---

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of May, two thousand twenty-four.

---

Lidia M. Orrego,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano  
LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP, First  
Choice Evaluations LLC, Jason Hochfelder, MD,

**ORDER**

Docket No: 23-7928

Defendants - Appellees,

v.

John Doe, Jane Doe,

Defendants.


---

Appellant, Lidia M. Orrego, filed a motion for panel reconsideration, or, in the alternative, for reconsideration *en banc*. The panel that determined the appeal has considered the request for reconsideration, and the active members of the Court have considered the request for reconsideration *en banc*.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is denied.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

  
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

**2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS** Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al

Joan M. Azrack, presiding

Anne Y. Shields, referral

**Date filed:** 08/31/2023**Date of last filing:** 05/15/2024**Docket Information and Related Docket Entries**  
**Case 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Document 99999****Filed:** 10/30/2023**Entered:** 10/30/2023**Entered By:** Joseph S Bonafede,**Event Name(s):** Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File**Full Docket Text:**

ORDER denying 27 Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File. Before the Court is an application from pro se Plaintiff Lidia Orrego seeking permission for electronic case filing via the Court's Electronic Case filing system ("ECF"). The application is denied without prejudice. Plaintiff has demonstrated her ability to upload and submit documents utilizing the Court's electronic mailbox, Box.com, and her submissions have promptly been uploaded to the public docket where appropriate. However, Plaintiff's frequent uploading of voluminous and/or improper documents on Box.com gives the Court pause. In the absence of Plaintiff alleging any prejudice as a result of the current system, her application is denied without prejudice. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB)

**All Related Docket Entries****Filed:** 10/26/2023**Entered:** 10/27/2023**Entered By:** Lisa Florio,**Event Name(s):** Motion for leave to allow Pro Se to Electronically File**Full Docket Text for Document 27:**

MOTION for leave to allow Pro Se to Electronically File by Lidia M. Orrego. (LF)

**Filed:** 11/29/2023**Entered:** 11/29/2023**Entered By:** Concetta M Landow,**Event Name(s):** Electronic Index to Record on Appeal**Full Docket Text:**

Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 30 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (CL)

**Filed:** 11/29/2023**Entered:** 11/29/2023**Entered By:** Concetta M Landow,**Event Name(s):** Notice of Interlocutory Appeal**Full Docket Text for Document 30:**

NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL as to Order on Motion for Leave to Allow Pro Se to Electronically File and Order by Lidia M. Orrego. (CL) (Main Document 30 replaced on 11/29/2023) (CL).

**Filed:** 11/29/2023**Entered:** 11/29/2023**Entered By:** Concetta M Landow,**APPENDIX B**

**2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS** Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
 Joan M. Azrack, presiding  
 Anne Y. Shields, referral  
 Date filed: 08/31/2023  
 Date of last filing: 05/15/2024

**Docket Information and Related Docket Entries**  
**Case 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Document 99999**

Filed: 10/30/2023

Entered: 10/30/2023

Entered By: Joseph S Bonafede,

Event Name(s): Order

**Full Docket Text:**

ORDER. Before the Court is the voluminous October 12, 2023 submission from pro se plaintiff Lidia Orrego via Box.com, DE 26. Notably, apart from the two-page letter to the Court, the additional 356 pages appear to be documentary discovery that does not comply with the Local Rules of this Court. See Local Civil Rule 5.1. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court shall docket only the first two pages of this submission and shall delete the balance of Plaintiff's submission from Box.com. Plaintiff is cautioned that document submission via Box.com is a privilege but may be revoked if abused. Should Plaintiff continue to upload lengthy submissions in contravention of the Court's rules, she may be required to file papers in hard copy via the mail and/or in person. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB)

**No Related Docket Entries**

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
07/31/2024 20:08:27			
PACER Login:	[REDACTED]	Client Code:	
Description:	Related Transactions	Search Criteria:	2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.10

**APPENDIX C**

---

**Activity in Case 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al Order**

---

ecf\_bounces@nyed.uscourts.gov <ecf\_bounces@nyed.uscourts.gov>  
To: nobody@nyed.uscourts.gov

Mon, Oct 30, 2023 at 10:12 AM

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

**\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

Eastern District of New York

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 10/30/2023 at 10:12 AM EDT and filed on 10/30/2023

**Case Name:** Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al

**Case Number:** 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS

**Filer:**

**Document Number:** No document attached

**Docket Text:**

ORDER. Defendants filed pre-motion conference letters regarding anticipated motions to dismiss on 10/10/2023 (ECF No. [13]) and 10/13/2020 (ECF No. [19]). Under the Courts Individual Rules, Pro Se Plaintiff's responses to these letters were due 10/17/2023 and 10/20/2023, respectively, but to date, no response has been filed. Accordingly, Pro Se Plaintiff shall respond to Defendants' letters, in letters not to exceed three pages, by 11/10/2023. Failure to comply with this order may result in dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. Out of an abundance of caution, the Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order and ECF Nos. 13 and 19 to the Pro Se Plaintiff at her address of record.

Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 10/30/2023. (JSB)

**2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

David Stephen Wilck david.wilck@rivkin.com

Andrew Hamelsky ahamelsky@stradley.com

Jenifer Ann Scarcella jscarcella@stradley.com

Jason M. Biegel jason.biegel@rivkin.com

Lidia M. Orrego liorrego@gmail.com


**2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Notice will not be electronically mailed to:****APPENDIX D**

4a

**U.S. District Court**  
**Eastern District of New York (Central Islip)**  
**CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS**

Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP Date Filed: 08/31/2023  
et al Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Assigned to: Judge Joan M. Azrack Nature of Suit: 470 Racketeer/Corrupt  
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields Organization  
related Case: 2:20-cv-03361-JMA-AYS Jurisdiction: Federal Question  
Cause: 18:1964 Racketeering (RICO) Act

Date Entered	#	Docket Text
11/01/2023		<p>ORDER: The Court waives the pre-motion conference requirement for Defendants' anticipated motions to dismiss and accordingly DENIES Defendants' pre-motion conference requests for those motions at DEs <u>13</u> and <u>19</u>. Defendants shall serve (but not file) their motions to dismiss by <u>12/1/2023</u>, Plaintiff shall serve (but not file) her opposition papers by <u>1/19/2024</u>, and Defendants shall serve their reply papers by <u>2/7/2024</u>. Defendants shall <i>file</i> all motion papers on <u>2/7/2024</u>. <u>See</u> District Judge Joan M. Azrack's Individual Practice Rule ("Rule") IV.G.2. The parties are reminded that memoranda of law in support of, and in opposition to, motions are limited to 25 pages, and reply memoranda are limited to 15 pages. <u>See</u> Rule IV.C. Defendants shall comply with their obligation under Local Civil Rule 7.2 to provide Plaintiff with copies of authorities Defendants cite that are "unpublished or reported exclusively on computerized databases."</p> <p>Plaintiff's motion at DE <u>10</u> seeking "clarification" regarding anticipated service of process is DENIED AS MOOT given that proof of service was subsequently filed. <u>See</u> DE <u>15</u>. Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 11/1/2023. (CB) (Entered: 11/01/2023)</p>



**APPENDIX E**

**2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS** Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
 Joan M. Azrack, presiding  
 Anne Y. Shields, referral  
 Date filed: 08/31/2023  
 Date of last filing: 05/15/2024

**Docket Information and Related Docket Entries**  
**Case 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Document 99999**

Filed: 11/14/2023  
 Entered: 11/14/2023  
 Entered By: Joseph S Bonafede,  
 Event Name(s): Order  
 Full Docket Text:

ORDER. Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego ("Plaintiff") has filed two separate actions in this court (20-CV-3361 and 23-CV-6507), each arising from or relating to her former employment with the defendants in 20-CV-3361. On August 3, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Interlocutory Appeal in 20-CV-3361 seeking review of this Court's July 11, 2023 and July 20, 2023 Orders. (See 23-1114 (2d Cir. Aug. 4, 2023)). Of note, the July 11, 2023 Order denied Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration, to set aside, and to vacate Judge Brown's Order adopting the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Shields that denied Plaintiff's motion for a declaratory judgment and to change venue. Plaintiff had already made similar motions which Judge Brown denied by Order dated March 28, 2023 where he warned: "PLAINTIFF IS CAUTIONED ONCE AGAIN THAT THE CONTINUED FILING OF BLOATED AND WHOLLY UNSUPPORTED MOTIONS MAY SUBJECT HER TO THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS FOR ENGAGING IN FRIVOLOUS LITIGATION CONDUCT UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1927." Undeterred, Plaintiff has continued to file voluminous, repetitive, and unsupported motions in both of her cases. Indeed, since Judge Brown's March 28, 2023 warning, Plaintiff has filed an additional 26 motions in 20-CV-3361 alone, including a motion to certify an interlocutory appeal which this Court denied by Order dated July 28, 2023. Further, on October 31, 2023, Plaintiff has filed a 151-page "Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, Certiorari, and Prohibition" against the undersigned and Magistrate Judge Shields in the Second Circuit complaining of conduct alleged to have occurred in 20-CV-3361. See 23-7643 (2d Cir. Oct. 31, 2023). Accordingly, given Plaintiff's pending appeals and in an abundance of caution in light of her *pro se* status, the Court STAYS these matters pending resolution of the appeals. To be clear, Plaintiff **SHALL NOT** file any additional papers in either 20-CV-3361 or 23-CV-6507 and any submissions received via box.com, in person at the Clerks Office, or through the mail will not be considered or docketed. Plaintiff also **SHALL NOT** continue to contact the undersigned's chambers. Further, any papers the Clerk has received since August 3, 2023 in each case that have not yet been docketed shall be returned to Plaintiff. If any such filing exceeds 5 pages, the Clerk of the Court shall reference the returned document in a return letter and include only the first page of such submission. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. See *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). Ordered by Judge Joan M. Azrack on 11/14/2023. (JSB)

---

**All Related Docket Entries**

Filed: 11/29/2023  
 Entered: 11/29/2023  
 Entered By: Concetta M Landow,  
 Event Name(s): Electronic Index to Record on Appeal  
 Full Docket Text:

Electronic Index to Record on Appeal sent to US Court of Appeals. 30 Notice of Interlocutory Appeal Documents are available via Pacer. For docket entries without a hyperlink or for documents under seal, contact the court and we'll arrange for the document(s) to be made available to you. (CL)

**APPENDIX F**

6a

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Brenna B. Mahoney  
Clerk of Court

August Marziliano  
Chief Deputy, Brooklyn

Michael Kramer  
Chief Deputy, Central Islip



FILED  
CLERK

2:35 pm, Nov 14, 2023

Theodore Roosevelt Federal Courthouse  
Emanuel Cellar Federal Courthouse  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, NY 11201  
(718) 613-2270

Alfonse D'Amato Federal Courthouse  
100 Federal Plaza  
Central Islip, NY 11722  
(631) 712-6060

Lidia M. Orrego  
95-08 Queens Blvd.  
Apt. 3E  
Rego Park, NY 11374

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
LONG ISLAND OFFICE

RE: 23-CV-06507(JMA)(AYS) & 20-CV-03361(JMA)(AYS)

November 14, 2023

Dear Ms. Orrego:

Pursuant to Judge Azrack's Electronic Order dated November 14, 2023, the enclosed documents are being returned to you without docketing or consideration. Additionally, the Court is returning a full set of your papers received in Brooklyn on November 9, 2023 and in Central Islip on November 13, 2023, as a one-time courtesy. Otherwise, as Judge Azrack has instructed, we have enclosed the first page of your voluminous submissions.

Please note that any future submissions made in violation of the November 14, 2023 order will be rejected and discarded. Although you received electronic notifications on your cases, we have also enclosed a copy of the November 14, 2023 Order for your convenience.

Sincerely,

  
Pro Se Office  
By: K. Santana

Enc.

Copy mailed to litigant 11/14/2023

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

X

Lidia M. Orrego  
Plaintiff,

-against-

Kevin Knipfing a/k/a Kevin James,  
Stephanieanna James-Knipfing  
a/k/a Steffiana de la Cruz,  
Old Westbury EDDIE LLC,  
Old Westbury, LLC, Steve Savitsky,  
Teresa A. Zantua,

Defendant(s).

X

M. Judge Joan M. Azrack

EDNY 20CV3361 (JMA) (AYS)

NOTICE OF MOTION

- a) Disqualify Opposite Counsel for Ethical Violation, Conflict of Interest, Fraud, Perjury, Organized Crime
- b) Preliminary Injunction
- c) Protective Order
- d) Strike Pleadings

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the annexed affirmation of Lidia M. Orrego well-supported with Memoranda of Law and 13 Exhibits, total pages 73, sworn to or affirmed November 13, 2023, and upon the complaint herein, the Plaintiff will move this Court according to her Constitutional Right to Due Process of Law and Freedom of Speech, District Judge Joan M. Azrack U.S.J., in room 920, United States Courthouse, 100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY, 11722, on the day 30 of November 2023, at 10:30 am or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, for orders to protect her Right to Due Process a) Disqualify Opposite Counsel for Gross Ethical Violation, Conflict of Interest, Fraud, Perjury, Organized Crime; b) Preliminary Injunction; c) Protective or Restraining Order against Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLC; d) Strike ALL Fraudulent Pleadings and Motions filed by Defendants due Gross Ethical Violations.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 13, 2023

Rego Park, New York



Lidia M. Orrego  
Plaintiff Pro Se  
95-08 Queens Blvd. 3E  
Rego Park, NY 11374  
Phone 347-453-2234  
Email: [liorrego@gmail.com](mailto:liorrego@gmail.com)

Notice: COURT upholds the FRCP and Local Civil Rule under Due Process of Law; Plaintiff has the right to file the Reply to Defendants' Opposition before the RETURN DAY.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

X

Lidia M. Orrego

Plaintiff,  
-against-

Kevin Knipfing, a/k/a Kevin James,  
Stephanieanna James-Knipfing a/k/a Steffiana  
de la Cruz, Old Westbury EDDIE LLC,  
Old Westbury, LLC, Steve Savitsky,  
Teresa A. Zantua

Defendant(s).

Case No. 20CV3361(JMA)(AYS)

District Judge Joan M. Azrack

Affirmation

X

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REQUESTS PERMISSION FOR ELECTRONIC  
FILING TO FILE DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS UNDER FED. RULES  
CIVIL PROD., LOCAL CIVIL RULES 56.1 & 56.2 SUPPORTED BY  
CASE LAW Robinson v. De Niro SDNY 19cv09156 (LJL)(KHP)**

I, Lidia M. Orrego, Plaintiff, make the following affirmation under the penalties of perjury under her Constitutional Right to Due Process and Freedom of Speech request Permission to Electronically file her "EVIDENTIARY RECORD" to move or oppose Dispositive Motions due close of Discovery on November 1, 2023 under Fed. Rules Civil Proced., Local Civil Rule "56.1 Statements of Material Facts on Motion for Summary Judgment" states:

"(d) Each statement by the movant or opponent pursuant to Rule 56.1(a) and (b), including each statement controverting any statement of material fact, must be followed by citation to evidence which would be admissible, set forth as required by Fed. R. Civ.P. 56(c)." Parties' claims or defenses MUST rely on admissible evidence.

"Rule 56.2 Notice to Pro Se Litigant Who Opposes a Summary Judgment" states:

"Rather, you must submit evidence, such as witness statements or documents, countering the facts asserted by the defendant and raising specific facts that support your claim. If you have proof of your claim, now is the time to submit it. Any witness statements must be in the form of affidavits. An affidavit is a sworn statement of fact based on personal knowledge stating facts that would be admissible in evidence at trial. You may submit your own affidavit and/or the affidavits of others. You may submit affidavits that were prepared specifically in response to defendant's motion for summary judgment."

October 28, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: Orrego v. Knipfing et al.  
Docket No. 20CV3361(JMA)(AYS)

Re: Plaintiff's Report NEWLY Discovery the Client-Lawyer Relationship between Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Kevin James' aka Knipfing's counsel Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP since 2012, GROSS violation of Model Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest.- Total Pages filed 12.- UNSEAL under Federal Rule Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2.-

Dear District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Pro Se, Lidia M. Orrego, reports that she is investigating to find other victims of the same crimes under the RICO Act in this lawsuit and has discovered that the Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP who are still CURRENT attorneys for Plaintiff since they were never authorized to withdraw from case WCB G2584330 under 12 NYCRR 300.17(b)(2).

Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP (“Law Firm”), and Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP (“GRSM”) lawyers from the Defendants in the related case 20CV3361 (JMA) (AYS) are in a CLIENT-LAWYER relationship since 2012.

This relationship is a gross violation of Model Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest because the Plaintiff will never retain the Law Firm if they disclose to her the relationship as clients of GRSM because the Rule 1.7 is clear “the representation in from the Law Firm in the Plaintiff's WCB case G2584330 was prohibited by LAW”. This outrage fact is not only an ethical but also a moral violation of the trust that Plaintiff gave the Law Firm to handle her case, which should be established in the first hearing.

If Plaintiff had not hired the Law Firm, it would not have suffered all the irreversible damages, nor would it be in an appeal Docket 535740 Appellate Division Third Department.

The Law Firm protected Defendants First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD in all predicated acts, including but not limited to perjury, obstruction of justice, conspiracy, and fraud, among others, from September 2019 to August 2021.

October 28, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)

Re: Plaintiff's Report NEWLY Discovery the Client-Lawyer Relationship between Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Kevin James' aka Knipfing's counsel Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP since 2012, GROSS violation of Model Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest.- Total Pages filed 13.- UNSEAL under Federal Rule Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2.-

Dear District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Pro Se, Lidia M. Orrego, reports that she is investigating to find other victims of the same crimes under the RICO Act in this lawsuit and has discovered that the Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP who are still CURRENT attorneys for Plaintiff since they were never authorized to withdraw from case WCB G2584330 under 12 NYCRR 300.17(b)(2).

Defendants Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP ("Law Firm"), and Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP ("GRSM") lawyers from the Defendants in the related case 20CV3361 (JMA) (AYS) are in a CLIENT-LAWYER relationship since 2012.

This relationship is a gross violation of Model Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest because the Plaintiff will never retain the Law Firm if they disclose to her the relationship as clients of GRSM because the Rule 1.7 is clear "the representation in from the Law Firm in the Plaintiff's WCB case G2584330 was prohibited by LAW". This outrage fact is not only an ethical but also a moral violation of the trust that Plaintiff gave the Law Firm to handle her case, which should be established in the first hearing.

If Plaintiff had not hired the Law Firm, it would not have suffered all the irreversible damages, nor would it be in an appeal Docket 535740 Appellate Division Third Department.

The Law Firm protected Defendants First Choice Evaluations LLC and Jason Hochfelder MD in all predicated acts, including but not limited to perjury, obstruction of justice, conspiracy, and fraud, among others, from September 2019 to August 2021.

October 30, 2023

**Pro Se Office**  
**Docketing Department**  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

**Caption: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al**  
**Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)**

**Re: Plaintiff's Letter to Pro Se Office missing 356 pages ECF Id. [26]. (Total  
Pages filed 04.- Unseal Federal Rule Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2)**

Dear Clerk,

Plaintiff Pro Se, Lidia M. Orrego, requests to fix the docket since the ECF Id. [26] was submitted with a total of 358 Pages, but only the first 2 pages are in the Docket 23CV0507. See below the description on Page 1.

**Case 2:23-cv-06507-JMA-AYS Document 26 Filed 10/12/23 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 154**

Defendants First Choice Evaluation LLC, Dr. Jason Hochfelder, their counsel Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP, Mr. Hamelsky, and Ms. Scarcella must send the responses on or before October 16, 2023. If Defendants fail, all the evidence will be admitted as the Plaintiff claims. See annexed email and 354 pages of initial documentary evidence P. 3-357.

All the documents P. 3-357 belong to the NYSCEF Docket 535740 Appellate Division Third Department for that reason, the Confidential Personal Information (CPI) is redacted according to the Law. The last Page, 358, is the Plaintiff's Affirmation of Service.

Please, if you have any questions regarding this matter, Plaintiff requests to submit a letter via ECF to solve this apparent system error by uploading or transferring the document in the docket.

Respectfully submitted,

**Dated: October 30, 2023**  
Rego Park, New York

/s/ Lidia M. Orrego  
Plaintiff Pro Se  
95-08 Queens Blvd. 3E  
Rego Park, NY 11374  
Phone (347)453-2234  
Email: liorrego@gmail.com

November 7, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)

Re: Plaintiff's Letter Motion - Objection to Vacate Court's Order  
misrepresentation regarding her failure to file Defendants' Opposition Pre-Motion Letters  
ECF Id. [13] [19] - Total Pages filed 7.- unseal under Federal Rule Civil Procedure  
("FRCP") Rule 5.2.-

District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego objects to the Court's misrepresentation of the annexed Order dated October 30, 2023, that states she failed to timely oppose the Defendants' Pre-Motion Letter to Dismiss the Complaint ECF Id. [13] [19]. See annexed P. 3.

The plaintiff filed her Oppositions ECF Id. [24] and [25] on October 16, 2023, and October 17, 2023, but the Pro Se Office uploaded to the Docket after almost 10 (ten) days on October 26, 2023. See annexed P. 4-5.

Plaintiff called several times to the Pro Se office and spoke with several Court employees, including but not limited to Mike Kramer, Dwayne, Eric, etc. Even though she went in person, nobody could upload the documents. This Court can verify each Court's employee and the phone call records; also, Plaintiff, if it is necessary, can file the evidence upon the Court's request.

Plaintiff was sure that this Court would make any decision to her prejudice due to the delay of the Pro Se Office in sending the documents to the Docketing Department.

For all this situation, Plaintiff filed her Motion to E-filing for permission to E-file her own documents ECF Id. [27] because the Pro Se Office is not in control of uploading the documents on time; in fact, this Court has illegally manipulated, destroyed evidence, and sealed documents illegally to cover up all the Defendants' fraud.

November 7, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)

Re: Plaintiff's Objection and Letter MOTION to VACATE order due to Court's misrepresentation of the Local Rule 5.1 to justify spoliation of evidence - Total Pages filed 6.- unseal under Federal Rule Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2.-

District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego objects to the annexed order dated October 30, 2023, to the Court's misrepresentation and misapplying the Local Civil Rule 5.1 on ECF Id. [26] the document is not a motion, and Plaintiff is not seeking any relief from the Court.

Under her right to Freedom of Speech, Plaintiff states that this Court's purpose, with this heinous misrepresentation of the Local Civil Rules, constitutes an excuse to proceed with the spoliation of evidence. The Court does not have the power to modify or make "alterations" of documents filed by Plaintiff without her knowledge or consent because only it is against the Defendants. This Court violated the Constitutional Right of Due Process. THIS IS BEHAVIOR UNACCEPTABLE.

Plaintiff is entitled to submit "LENGTH or ANY EVIDENCE" that she considers proper, as she has been doing filings since July 2020 up to +500 pages in her motions and other forums, evidence of up to +2500 pages, and no one has tried to "alter this evidence" because that is illegal. See Local Civil Rule 12.1 – Notice for Pro Se Litigants.

This Court's heinous "order" does NOT make sense because each party is entitled to choose what evidence to file in their pleadings, letters-motions, or motions.

Plaintiff objects to the heinous order, which threatens to violate her Constitutional right of Due Process, just because this Court wants to protect the Defendants because they will file Motions to Dismiss with Affirmative Defenses without any evidence.

November 8, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al  
Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)

Re: Plaintiff's Objection and Letter MOTION to VACATE the order due to the Court's misrepresentation in the order on Motion for Permission For Electronic Case Filing ECF Id. [27] - Total Pages filed 8.- unseal under Federal Rule Civil Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2, Constitutional Right of Due Process and Freedom of Speech

District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego objects to the annexed order dated October 30, 2023, to the Court's misrepresentation on her Motion for Permission For Electronic Case Filing ECF Id. [27] for the following reasons:

Fact 1: It is NOT true that Plaintiff's submissions via Box.com or in person are "promptly" "to the public docket is appropriate." Plaintiff submitted on October 28, 2023, the letter with **irrefutable** evidence document "Report NEWLY Discovery the Client-Lawyer Relationship between Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Kevin James' aka Knipfing's counsel Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP since 2012, GROSS violation of Model Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest" total pages filed 13.-

This Court has been hiding the Plaintiff's report for over a week because she is making the follow-up, and the letter was sent to the Docket Depart. on October 30, 2023. Reason: Workers Compensation Board case G2584330 was a HOAX – NYSCEF Id. [136].

Evidence on Fact 1: See attached Exhibit 1 " diagram "Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations - RICO Act SCHEME - "ENTERPRISE" WELL - SUPPORTED BY GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI LLC" shows all the Associates. P. 5.

See attached Exhibit 2 Box.com submission filed October 28, 2023. P. 6.

November 8, 2023

District Judge Joan M. Azrack  
United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)  
100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722  
Attn: Pro Se Office - via Pro Se Electronic Document Submission

Caption: **Orrego v. Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano LLP et al**  
**Docket No. 23CV06507(JMA)(AYS)**

**Re: Plaintiff's Objection to Defendants Letters Answer ECF Id. [20] [21]**  
improper and Bad Faith - Total Pages filed 10.- unseal under Federal Rule Civil  
Procedure ("FRCP") Rule 5.2, Constitutional Right of Due Process and Freedom of  
Speech

District Judge Azrack,

Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego objects to the improper and fraudulent  
misrepresentation to Defendants Letter Answer ECF Id. [20] [21] because the  
request for authentication of the conclusive evidence see ECF Id. [22] [26],  
Defendants MUST answer in Plaintiff Opposition to Motions to Dismiss under  
FRCP Rule 12, "Local Civil Rule 12.1. Notice to Pro Se Litigant Who Opposes a  
Rule 12 Motion Supported by Matters Outside the Pleadings".

Defendants are aware that their Letters Answer ECF Id. [20] [21] are full of  
nonsensical and both letters are identical with minimum differences because they  
are part of the "organized crime" with Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton &  
Romano LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP and Kevin James' aka  
Knipfing's counsel Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP.

The same lawyers are in the cases of legal malpractices, as Plaintiff detailed  
in her Letter Dated October 28, 2023, illegally retained by this Court:

"Other cases against Pasternack Tilker Ziegler Walsh Stanton & Romano  
LLP, Pasternack Tilker Weitz & Luxenberg LLP for legal malpractice, and others  
torts in the State Court including but not limited to NYSCEF 2020/05603;

**ORIGINAL**

November 9, 2023


**Pro Se Office**

**United States District Court Eastern District of New York (EDNY)**

**100 Federal Plaza, Central Islip, NY 11722**

**CC: District Judge Joan M. Azrack**

**Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields**



**Caption: Lidia M. Orrego v. Kevin Knipfing a/k/a Kevin James,  
Stephanieanna James-Knipfing a/k/a Steffiana, de la Cruz,  
Old Westbury EDDIE LLC, Old Westbury LLC, Steve Savitsky,  
Teresa A. Zantua  
Docket No. 20CV3361(JMA)(AYS)**

**Re: Plaintiff's Return "ORIGINAL" Personal Service of Writ of Mandamus  
Certiorari and Prohibition- Total Pages 157.- under Federal Rule Civil Procedure  
("FRCP") Rule 5.2, Constitutional Right of Due Process, Freedom of Speech**

Dear Clerk,

Plaintiff Lidia M. Orrego objects to the improper return of the Personal Service to District Judge Joan M. Azrack and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields.

The plaintiff requests one more time this Court stop the manipulation of the documents to prevent Public Scrutiny because this case is in the Public INTEREST, and this Court is abusing its power and discretion by making spoliation of evidence. The document was filed two times in the docket already ECF Id. [175] and [176].

Also, Plaintiff requests that this COURT call her or send an email before returning the documents to avoid unnecessary expenses from the taxpayers' money and her money because the annexed page 22 of the ECF ID. [175] [176] it is obvious and shows the Certificate of Service under the Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure, and the document is a personal service. This was NOT a mistake, as the Court stated improperly in their note ECF ID. [175].

Writ of Mandamus Certiorari and Prohibition to QUASH ALL the illegal orders from District Judge Joan M. Azrack and Magistrate Judge Anne Y. Shields, including the last heinous orders dated October 30, 2023. The plaintiff's Writ of Mandamus shows the outrageous behavior of D. Judge Azrack and M. Judge Shields not only against the United States Constitution and rules that govern this forum but also against IMMORAL ORDERS and unacceptable behavior.