



ZACHARY W. CARTER
Corporation Counsel

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
LAW DEPARTMENT
100 CHURCH STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10007

CHERYL SHAMMAS
Senior Counsel
phone: (212) 356-2406
fax: (212) 356-3509
cshammas@law.nyc.gov

July 29, 2015

BY ECF & EMAIL (Andrei Vrabie@nysd.uscourts.gov)

Honorable Robert W. Sweet
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

Re: *Schoolcraft v. The City of New York, et al.*, 10-CV-6005 (RWS)

Your Honor:

I am a Senior Counsel in the office of Zachary W. Carter, Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, assigned to represent the City Defendants in the above-referenced action. I write to respectfully request that the Court strike Plaintiff's Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of his Motion for Reconsideration (Docket No. 464) and decline to consider any of the arguments contained therein on grounds that the filing was untimely. Defendants Jamaica Hospital Medical Center and Steven Mauriello, the other parties who filed briefs opposing plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, also join in this application.

Pursuant to agreement between all parties, and as so ordered by this Court on July 17, 2015 (Docket Entry No. 458), July 23, 2015 was the due date for all Reply memoranda in support of the motions for reconsideration filed by plaintiff, the City Defendants, Mauriello and Jamaica Hospital Medical Center.¹ All parties complied with that deadline except plaintiff, who served and filed his Reply in the late afternoon of July 24, 2015. At no point did plaintiff request an extension from any defendant or the Court; seek leave of Court to file after the deadline; or even acknowledge, apologize for or explain plaintiff's failure to meet the deadline.²

¹ All parties had previously been granted a one-week extension of time, on consent, from the original deadline of July 17, 2015.

² In addition, plaintiff's memorandum exceeds by four (4) pages the Court's 10-page limit for reply memoranda, without having requested permission to do so. Although plaintiff was responding to more than one opposition brief, consent and leave of Court ought to have been

Continued...

