

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

-----X
DORIS LING-COHAN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NYP HOLDINGS, INC., JULIA MARSH,
CARL CAMPANILE, LAURA ITALIANO
and JOHN AND/OR JANE DOES 1-10,

Defendants.
-----X

Date Filed:
Index No.:

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Doris Ling-Cohan (“Plaintiff” or “Justice Ling-Cohan”), by her attorneys, Caraballo & Mandell, PLLC, complaining of the defendants NYP Holdings, Inc. (“NYP”), Julia Marsh (“Marsh”), Carl Campanile (“Campanile”) and Laura Italiano (“Italiano’.), sometimes collectively referred to as “NYP”) and “John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 (“Doe”); alleges as follows:

Parties

1. Justice Ling-Cohan is a resident of the State of New York, City of New York, County of New York, and a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, sitting in the County of New York. Justice Ling-Cohan was and is a member in good standing of the bar of State of New York and a member of the Judiciary. Until the publication of the defamatory matters alleged below, Justice Ling-Cohan was held in high esteem by her colleagues on the bench, her superiors, and the legal community for her integrity, character, demeanor, and intellect; and could look forward to a bright future on the bench and thereafter, if she so desired, in private practice. Justice Ling-Cohan was a well-known mentor and role model in the Asian-American and Minority and other communities. She is well-known locally, nationally and

internationally as the first person of Asian/Chinese descent to have been elected from Judicial District 2, which includes Chinatown. Justice Ling-Cohan has served in numerous community, local, national and international bar and judicial organizations, including, serving as President of the Asian Pacific American Judges, Federal and State for many years and hosting hundreds of International Scholars and Judges.

2. Upon information and belief, defendant NYP is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1211 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036. NYP is the owner and operator of the New York Post newspaper, nypost.com and nypostonline.com. Three editions of The New York Post are published each day: the “Metro Edition,” the “Early Edition”, and the “Late Night/Sports Edition.” Each edition is targeted to a separate audience. Upon information and belief, The New York Post newspapers, and nypost.com and nypostonline.com (collectively, the “Post Websites”) are published and transmitted to millions of readers on a daily basis, both inside and outside of New York.

3. Upon information and belief, defendant Marsh is a resident of the State of New York and an employee or representative or agent of NYP. At all times relevant hereto, defendant Marsh was, and still is, engaged in the business of writing articles for NYP. Upon information and belief, she is a self-described, “New York Post reporter covering Manhattan Supreme Court”.

4. Upon information and belief, defendant Campanile is a resident of the State of New York and an employee or representative or agent of NYP. At all times relevant hereto, defendant Campanile was, and still is, engaged in the business of writing articles for NYP, especially on issues about judicial selection and New York politics.

5. Upon information and belief, defendant Italiano is a resident of the State of New York and an employee or representative or agent of NYP. At all times relevant hereto, defendant Italiano was, and still is, engaged in the business of writing articles for NYP, especially on issues about judicial selection and New York politics.

6. Defendants John and/or Jane Doe 1 - 10 are the alleged “sources” of the information and statements published by the Post Defendants in Libelous Articles One through Four, discussed below.

LIBELOUS ARTICLE ONE
(August 31, 2016)

7. On August 31, 2016, the Post Defendants falsely and maliciously published a full-page article in the New York Post and its related internet-based publications, under the headline: **“Democratic Party bars ‘Lazy’ pro-LGBT judge from election ticket”**.

8. The headline was followed by a large photograph of Justice Ling-Cohan, taken for two NYP articles published in or about Sept 2, 2005, announcing Supreme Court Justice Ling-Cohan, as their "Liberty Medal Nominee" and "The best of the best city" (“Liberty Photo”).

9. In Libelous Article One, the Liberty Photo was under a headline falsely announcing that the Democratic Party had barred Justice Ling-Cohan from reelection, purportedly because she was “lazy”, followed by an article stating in pertinent part:

“A Manhattan judge who is considered a hero in the LGBT Community *has been barred from running* on the Democratic ticket, a move that virtually dooms her re-election prospects in November.

The county Democratic Party’s judicial screening panel took the highly unusual step Tuesday night of not reapproving the judge, Appellate Term Justice Doris Ling-Cohan.

* * *

“The *panel found* the judge was “lazy” and “slow” in handling her caseload, multiple sources said.

For a sitting New York County Justice, not to be reappointed is a first, to my knowledge,” said Dankberg.

“This is very unusual. This is a shocker – you’ve told me shocking news,” said longtime Manhattan judicial blogger and watchdog Alan Flacks.

* * *

“Two years ago, the Chinatown-raised Ling-Cohan became the first woman of Asian Descent in the State to be appointed to an appellate court; in 2002, she became the first Asian woman to be elected to state Supreme Court.

But she is best known for her decision, in a five-couple class-action suit in 2005, to approve the right of same-sex couples to marry. She was the first judge in the state to do so, though her decision was quickly reversed on appeal.

Rejecting Ling-Cohan was “a slap in the face” to the LGBT Community, said gay Democratic district leader Allen Roskoff.

‘Judge Ling-Cohan is a great judge.’ Roskoff said. ‘She is a hero \and needs to be championed and revered.’

Typically, the party rubber-stamps an incumbent judge’s re-election.

But *sources* told The Post that the screening panel’s membership of *nearly two dozen Manhattan lawyers and legal association reps* turned thumbs down on Ling-Cohan *out of a consensus that she was a lackluster judge.*

Somebody had it in for her, and there were five Asian-Americans on the panel who did not speak out for her,” said one expert with knowledge of the decision.

“Ling-Cohan’s reputation is “as one of the worst judges – non-productive, lazy, not hard-working, disorganized, takes a lot of time off, late with decisions” the source said.

“When she moved up to the Appellate Term in 2014, she left behind a Supreme Court backlog of hundreds of unfinished cases and undecided motions, said another source.

Still another source said that two or three votes were taken Tuesday night, “to try to persuade people to change their vote’ and approve her – but the efforts failed.

‘It’s a s-----ty thing to do this to a sitting judge,” that source added. ‘It’s an unwritten rule that you really don’t find a sitting judge all of a sudden after 14 years unqualified, unless they’re an ax murderer or a pedophile.”

(“Libelous Article One”). A copy of Libelous Article One is annexed hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein as if fully reprinted and reproduced herein. A copy of the Liberty Photo and two NYP Articles are annexed hereto as Exhibit B.

10. The headline of Libelous Article One was understood and intended by the Post Defendants to be understood, as a statement that (i) the *Democratic Party*, not a screening panel; (ii) had barred Justice Ling-Cohan from the “*election ticket*”; (iii) *because* she was “lazy”.

11. The statement in Libelous Article was understood and intended by the Post Defendants to be understood, as a statement that the *Democratic Party* had affirmatively acted to bar Justice Ling-Cohan from being a candidate on the Democratic ballot.

12. The statement in Libelous Article One, that according to multiple sources, “*the panel* found [Justice Ling-Cohan] was ‘lazy’ and ‘slow’ in handling her caseload”, was intended to and did falsely convey to the public that a majority of the panel, consisting of “*nearly two dozen Manhattan lawyers and legal association reps, [. . .],* five of whom [allegedly] were also Asian-American, made a factual determination, presumably by objective evidence, that Justice Ling-Cohan was lazy and slow in handling her caseload.

13. The use of the words “lazy” and “slow” were, as used about an Asian-American hero of the community, scandalous, shameful, and reprehensible as they represent the traits most valued by such communities. The statement that “several members of the panel were Asian-American”, was intended to and did imply that the purportedly the reason for the Panel’s decision, was true and accurate as determined by a representative group of lawyers and legal representatives of the community.

14. Libelous Article One reported that only two years ago, Ling-Cohan became the first woman of Asian-American descent to be appointed to an appellate court and in 2002 was the first to be elected to the State Supreme Court, but had purportedly become “lazy and slow in handling her case load”. NYP did not report that it had nominated Supreme Court Justice Ling-Cohan as the Best of the Best. See Exhibit B.

15. The NYP acknowledged in Libelous Article One, that known experts in the Judicial Selection process identified by name and position expressed shock and disbelief, noting that the Panel’s decision to not approve Justice Ling-Cohan for reelection purportedly because she was “lazy” and “slow” in handling her caseload was unprecedented and completely inconsistent with her documented record of writing (over 200 published decisions as of 2014 and industriously championing causes in her community and the profession. The NYP nonetheless adopted the words “lazy judge” in its headline above the Liberty Photo.

16. The statement in Libelous Article One, allegedly made by an unidentified source that; “Ling-Cohan’s reputation is “as one of the worst judges – non-productive, lazy, not hard-working, disorganized, takes a lot of time off, late with decisions said the source”, was understood and intended by the Post Defendants as a factual statement, that was easily disproved by the Office of Court Administration’s records for Justice Ling-Cohan.

17. The statement in Libelous Article One that “sources told The Post that the screening panel’s membership of nearly two dozen Manhattan lawyers and legal association reps turned thumbs down on Ling-Cohan out of a consensus that she was a lackluster judge” is belied by the fact reported in Libelous Article One that only two-years earlier, Justice Ling-Cohan had been promoted to the Supreme Court, Appellate Term, becoming the first Asian-American woman appointed to that position.

18. The term “lackluster” is commonly known and understood by the public to describe a person who is bland, uninspiring, and not distinguished. The assertion that there was a consensus in the Panel that she was “lackluster” is also inconsistent with the quotes attributed to credible identified individuals with knowledge of Justice Ling-Cohan’s experience and history as a Judge. The NYP nonetheless published the boldfaced headline in Libelous Article One.

19. The Post Defendants reported that sources, identified by name, had speculated before the publication of Libelous Article One, that “someone had it in for” Justice Ling-Cohan because it was incredible given Plaintiff’s career that she would be found lazy and not recommended for reelection but published Libelous Article One with the defamatory headline.

20. The allegations in Libelous Article One that the panel found that Justice Ling-Cohan was “lazy” and “slow” were intended to and did attack the core attributes a Judge must possess: industriousness, efficiency, and the swift and timely delivery of justice. They are also the antithesis of the Asian American stereotype and what the community values and expects its first representative on the Appellate Term.

21. NYP and/or their sources went beyond accurately reporting that the screening panel had not approved Justice Ling-Cohan for reappointment. They falsely and maliciously and/or with reckless disregard for the truth, reported that the “Democratic Party”, not a screening

panel, had barred Justice Ling-Cohan for reelection because she was “lazy and slow with her caseload”.

**LIBELOUS ARTICLE ONE WAS REPUBLISHED
IN CHINESE LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS**

22. The NYP knew that Justice Ling-Cohan was widely respected and well-known in the Asian-American community (See Exhibit B) and that the false and defamatory statements contained in Libelous Article One would be widely circulated in the Chinese language papers, given her standing in that community as someone who broke glass ceilings.

23. From September 1 through September 7, at least two Chinese language newspapers, “The World Journal,” and “Sing Tao Daily” republished the defamatory statements contained in Libelous Article One. A copy of the September 1 and September 3 articles together with their translation are annexed hereto collectively as Exhibit “C”.

**LIBELOUS ARTICLE TWO
(September 6, 2016)**

24. On September 6, 2017, the New York Post and its related Internet pages ran a banner headline in bold, large print: **“Democratic base rails against party pols for barring ‘lazy’ judge”** (‘Libelous Article Two’). Directly underneath the headline was the Liberty Photo. A copy of Libelous Article Two is annexed hereto as Exhibit “D” and incorporated herein as if it had been fully reprinted.

25. The text below the headline of Libelous Article Two states in relevant part as follows:

“Manhattan Democratic leader Keith Wright is coming under intense pressure from key members of his Democratic base – gay leaders and tenant activists – to reverse the decision of a screening panel that found Supreme Court Justice Doris Ling-Cohan not qualified for re-election.

I am outraged by the decision...I can assure you that this outrage is shared by the larger tenant community, tenant-advocacy community, legal services, Legal Aid and private tenant bar, tenant leader Michael McKee told Wright in a letter.

McKee said Ling-Cohan is a champion of tenant rights and claimed the landlord lobby is out to get her.

It seems clear that Justice Ling-Cohan has made a lot of enemies among the landlord bar with her decisions and somehow these enemies have been able to manipulate the screening panel in an attempt to end her career. I don't know what Curtis Arluck and Louise Dankberg were smoking, but this decision is a travesty.: he said, referring to party officials overseeing judgeship selections.

* * *

Lower East Side Councilwoman Rosie Mendez and other backers of Ling-Cohan are planning a press conference at City Hall Tuesday to demand the screening committee reverse itself.

* * *

"Ling-Cohan became the first Asian woman to be elected to state Supreme court in 2002.

But the *panel found* the judge was "lazy" and "slow in handling her caseload, multiple sources told the Post.

'Doris Ling-Cohan is one of the most distinguished judges in the New York judiciary,' said Allen Roskoff, president of the gay Jim Owles Democratic Club."

In her thirty years on the bench she has developed a well-deserved reputation for fairness and meticulously written decisions. We cannot afford to lose her".

26. The statement in the headline of Libelous Article Two: "**Democratic base rails against party pols for barring 'lazy' judge** followed by the Liberty Photo is understood and was intended by the Post Defendants to communicate (i) the factual statement that Justice Ling-Cohan is a lazy judge, (ii) that "party pols" had barred her from reelection. and

(iii) the Democratic base is railing against the party pols because the base wants to elect a “lazy” judge.

27. The statement in the headline of Libelous Article Two is false and defamatory. The use of the word “Lazy” in quotes was intended by the Post Defendants to communicate and is commonly understood by the readers and the members of the public to signify that the subject is slothful, sluggish, and, if a Judge, not fulfilling her obligations to dispense justice in a timely, efficient and effective manner.

28. The use of the words “lazy” and “slow” were intentional, purposeful and intended to convey to the Public that Justice Ling-Cohan, an Asian-American woman was the antithesis of the Asian-American “stereotype” of hard working and diligent.

**THE CHINESE LANGUAGE PRESS REPUBLISHED
SUBSTANTIAL PORTIONS OF LIBELOUS ARTICLE TWO**

29. The NYP knew of Justice Ling-Cohan was widely respected and well-known in the Asian-American community (See Exhibit B) and that the false and defamatory statements contained in Libelous Article Two would be widely circulated in the Chinese language papers.

30. From September 7, 2016 through September 9, 2017, two widely-read Chinese language newspapers, “The World Journal,” and “Sing Tao Daily” republished the defamatory statements contained in Libelous Article Two. A copy of the September 9 article, together with its translation is annexed hereto collectively as Exhibit “E’.

**THE RALLY OF SUPPORT FOR
MANHATTAN JUDGE CONTRADICTS THE
LIBELOUS STATEMENTS THAT JUSTICE LING-COHAN IS
LAZY, SLOW, BEHIND IN HER CASELOAD AND/ OR LACKLUSTER**

31. On September 6, 2016, the New York Law Journal (“NYLJ”) published an article under the headline” “At City Hall Rally, Outcry of Support for Manhattan Judge”. (NYLJ 1”); which reported in pertinent part as follows:

More than 100 supporters of Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Doris Ling-Cohan waived signs and chanted from the steps of City Hall on Tuesday, calling for Manhattan Democratic Leader Keith Wright to overturn an independent screening panel’s decision that deemed her unqualified for re-election in November.

On Aug. 31, in a story published in the New York Post, multiple unnamed sources from the panel were quoted as saying that Ling-Cohan was found to be “lazy” and “slow” in handling her caseload, thereby resulting in her name not moving forward to a Democratic judiciary nominating convention set for Sept. 22, even though three other incumbent judges were put through.

“The “lazy” and “slow” label was one that supporters of Ling-Cohan called “outrageous” at the rally; they argued it was merely a smokescreen for nefarious reasons for trying to know Ling-Cohan from the bench.”

‘She is prolific [as a judge] and her record speaks for itself.’ Said City Councilwoman Margaret Chin, whose district includes Chinatown in Manhattan, where Ling-Cohan was born and raised. Raising her voice over the claps and cheers of an erupting crowd, Chin said, ‘So when an anonymous source goes to the New York Post and says she is lazy, it is unfounded, it’s untrue and you can check the record with the Office of Court Administration.

Chin and council member Rosie Mendez’ press offices also provided statistics on Tuesday that they claimed proved just how productive Ling-Cohan has been since taking the bench.”

A copy of the New York Law Journal Article is annexed hereto as Exhibit “F” and is incorporated herein as if fully reproduced herein.

**LIBELOUS ARTICLE THREE
(SEPTEMBER 8, 2016)**

32. On September 8, 2016, after the Rally and the article in NYLJ 1 confirming that it was an independent screening panel, not the Democratic Party, or Pols that deemed Justice Ling-Cohan unqualified for re-election, the New York Post Defendants falsely and maliciously published a full-page article in the New York Post and its related internet-based publications, under the headline: **“Democratic leader won’t overturn decision to re-elect ‘lazy’ judge”** The headline was followed by photographs of Democratic Party Leader Keith Wright and Supreme Court Justice Ling-Cohan. The article stated in relevant part as follows:

“Manhattan Democratic Party chairman Keith Wright says he disagrees with his judicial screening panel’s controversial decision that found state Supreme Court Justice Doris Ling-Cohan not qualified for re-election – but wont overturn it.

In a carefully worded statement, Wright said he would abide by the panel’s recommendation event though “I fundamentally disagree” with its decision.

He praised Ling-Cohan for ‘ground breaking decisions’ and being ‘a standard bearer for her community’.

Members of the screening panel found Ling-Cohan to be a ‘lazy’ judge with a backlog of cases, sources told the Post.

But it’s rare for a judge to be tossed.

About 75 Ling-Cohan supports attended a rally outside City Hall Tuesday calling for the judge’s reappointment. The backers included six city and state legislators who represent Manhattan districts.

A true and correct copy of Libelous Article Three is annexed hereto as Exhibit G and incorporated herein as if fully reprinted herein.

33. The headline in Libelous Article Three was intended by the Post Defendants to be understood, as a statement of fact that Justice Ling-Cohan is a 'lazy' judge.

34. The statement in Libelous Article Three, that "*members* of the Screening Panel found Ling-Cohan to be a 'lazy' judge with a backlog of cases", modified the original assertion in Libelous Article One and Two, that *the Panel* found Ling-Cohan to be lazy and slow, but did not inform the public of the false statement alleged in Libelous Article One.

35. Libelous Article Three republished the purported statement that "members of the screening panel found" Justice Ling-Cohan to be lazy and had a backlog of cases" despite the uncontroverted declarations at the Rally, as reported in the NYLJ 1, that "when an anonymous source goes to the New York Post and says she is lazy, it is unfounded, it's untrue and you can check the record with the Office of Court Administration" and that "Chin and council member Rosie Mendez' press offices also provided statistics on Tuesday that they claimed proved just how productive Ling-Cohan has been since taking the bench."

36. The Post republished the Libelous Statements in Libelous Article 3, despite overwhelming evidence that the statements are false.

37. The new statement that "members", not the panel, described Justice Ling-Cohan as "lazy" is an admission that the statements made in Libelous Articles One and Two were false, and were likely made with knowledge of their falsity or with reckless disregard for the truth.

38. NYP continued to emphasize the words, "Lazy Judge" in the headline of Libelous Article Three despite acknowledging that the majority of the Panel had NOT determined that

Justice Ling Cohan was “lazy and/or had a backlog of cases”, but allegedly that statement was allegedly attributable to “members” of the Panel.

39. The NY Post Defendants also restated the “backlog of cases” comment despite objective evidence demonstrating that Justice Ling-Cohan ranked above-average in the disposition of her cases.

Libelous Article Three reported that “Ling-Cohan[‘s] supporters attended a rally outside City Hall Tuesday calling for the judge’s reappointment” but failed to report that Justice Ling-Cohan was above-average in resolving her caseload.

**A MAJORITY OF THE JUDICIAL SCREENING PANEL
MEMBERS CONFIRM THE FALSITY OF THE LIBELOUS
ARTICLES BUT NO RETRACTION WAS PUBLISHED**

40. On September 9, 2016, the same day that Libelous Article Three was published, the NYLJ published an article titled: Lacking Nod from Screening Panel, Democratic Leaders Hint at Judge’s Re-Nomination”.

41. The NYLJ Article referenced the NY Post Libelous Articles stating:

“Others have also complained about anonymous comments to the New York Post last week that suggested screening members voted against Ling-Cohan because she was “lazy” and “slow” in handling her caseload. At a rally in support of Ling-Cohan on Tuesday, more than 100 supporters call that notion ‘outrageous’.

“The offices of City Council members Margaret Chin and Rosie Mendez provided a comprehensive list of statistics, attributed to the Office of Court Administration, which they claimed proved that Ling-Cohan often had been “above average” in productivity compared to her colleagues.”

42. On September 13, 2017, the New York Law Journal wrote an article titled: “Screening Panel Seeks Revote on Ling-Cohan’s Rating”. (“NYLJ,Article 2”).

43. The NYLJ Article 2 stated in pertinent part that:

A majority of the screening panel that deemed state Supreme Court Justice Doris Ling-Cohan unqualified for re-election wants the Manhattan Democratic Part to allow it to revote.

Several panel members told party leaders that ‘new material information’ has emerged, that rules governing the process were not followed, and that the voting process itself “was very rushed and disorganized”.

In one letter emailed on Sunday [September 10] 13 members of the panel - 13 of the panels 22 members, a greater number than the majority needed to approve Ling-Cohan for reelection – wrote: [. . .]

‘While referring to news coverage that reported using unnamed sources, that some of the panel deemed Ling-Cohan to be “lazy” and “slow” in handling her caseload, the panelists wrote: ‘we also wish to clarify that the words “lazy” and “slow” reported in various New York Post articles, were not words we heard used by the panel”.

An earlier letter signed September 7, 2016 by seven screening panel members detailed several reasons why they believed the process was flawed, pointing out for instance that incumbent judges such as Ling-Cohan should be given deference under the rules, but that did not happen.”

In addition, at a rally for Ling-Cohan at City Hall last Tuesday, more than 100 supporters including retired Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Emily Jane Goodman and leaders of area bars associations, charged that discrimination played a role in what they said was an unprecedented move to not approve an incumbent judge for re-election.

44. The letter referenced in NYLJ 1 was signed by more than a majority of the Panelist, confirmed, that they had never heard the defamatory words uttered, proves the falsity of the defamatory statements.

NYP ARTICLE FOUR
(September 12, 2016)

45. On September 12, 2016, the Post Defendants published an article in the New York Post entitled “Judge wins re-election ballot after being barred” (“NYP Article Four”).

46. NYP Article Four stated in pertinent part:

“Justice will be served for Manhattan Judge Doris Ling-Cohan.

In an extraordinary reversal of a decision made by its own screening panel, the Manhattan Democratic Party will nominate Ling-Cohan to be put on the ballot for re-election as a state Supreme Court justice this fall at the party’s September 22 convention, sources said.

The screening panel had found Ling-Cohan not qualified for re-election – setting off a firestorm within the Democratic Party.

“In a stunning admission, a top official of the Manhattan Democrats said the 22-member screening panel had committed *an injustice* against Ling-Cohan.

‘The panel did not follow its rules in regard to considering incumbents.’ Curtis Arluck, chairman of the party’s judicial committee told the Post on Sunday.

‘He said a sitting judge being considered for re-election should get deference or the benefit of the doubt unless there are documented instances of egregious ethical or professional conduct.

‘The panel did not apply that standard,’ Arluck said. There was no obvious issue. There was nothing even egregious.”

A source familiar with the selection process said the reasons given to reject Ling-Cohan bordered on the trivial.

Arluck confirmed that he had received a letter from Ling-Cohan suggesting that members on the panel who had a personal axe to grind because of her unfavorable rulings toward them. Questions have been raised about why those panel members did not recuse themselves.

The vote not to re-nominate her was a razor-thin 12-10.

Court insiders say her statistical record in handling and disposing of cases put her in the middle of the pack, not at the bottom.

Arluck confirmed that five members of the screening panel sent him a formal letter requesting that the panel reconvene its decision but the point became moot when the executive committee voted to allow Ling-Cohan's name to be put in nomination at the party convention – which means her name will almost certainly be on the ballot in November.”

A true and correct copy of NYP Article Four is annexed hereto as Exhibit “H” and incorporated herein.

47. NYP Article Four did not republish the false and defamatory statements contained in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three, but did not retract or correct them.

48. NYP Article 4 quotes the Chair of the Judiciary Committee for the New York Democratic Party admitting that ‘The panel did not apply [the correct] standard,’ [...] “There was no obvious issue. Nothing even egregious”. The statement directly contradicted the libelous and defamatory statements in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three, but NYP did not issue a retraction or correction.

49. Libelous Articles One, Two and Three were intended to and did falsely convey to the Public that the “Democratic Party”, the “Party Pols” and the “Democratic Leaders barred Justice Ling-Cohan from reelection because she was “lazy and slow in handling her caseload”, “lackluster”, and had “a backlog of cases”. The public’s confidence in the judiciary is compromised and in Justice Ling-Cohan is diminished by the defamatory statements. It is an egregious dereliction of duty for a Judge to be lazy and slow in handling her caseload and taking time off. A sitting judge is charged with effectively and efficiently addressing disputes, rendering decisions and moving and disposing of cases in a timely manner.

50. To date, the NYP did not retract or correct the false and defamatory statements contained in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three, did not expose the alleged “sources” who libeled and defamed Justice Ling-Cohan despite her documented record as an excellent jurist and the admissions of a majority of the Panelist and the Democratic Party leaders that the statements of the still-unidentified sources were false.

51. Libelous Articles One, Two and Three, published by NYP were widely read, reprinted in other publications both in English and Chinese and discussed by, *inter alia*, the public at large, other jurists, lawyers, the Asian-American Community, locally, nationally and internationally, Court administrators, Court personnel, the legal community, litigants, colleagues, friends, and family of Justice Ling-Cohan.

52. The publication of Libelous Articles One, Two, and Three intended to and did defame Justice Ling-Cohan.

53. The false and defamatory matters set forth in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three were known to the Post Defendants to be false and/or were published with reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of the statement and with malicious intent to injure Justice Ling-Cohan.

54. The false and defamatory matters set forth in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three were published by the Post Defendants when, in fact, they entertained serious doubts as to the truth of the information comprising the publication and/or had a high degree of awareness of the probable falsity of the publication. Yet the Post Defendants caused them to be published with reckless disregard for the truth, demonstrating actual malice and with malicious intent to injure Justice Ling-Cohan.

55. The Post Defendants published the quotations, “lazy” and “slow” in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three concerning Plaintiff with knowledge of their falsity or with serious doubts as to their truth, exposing Justice Ling-Cohan to public ridicule, contempt, aversion, disgrace and induced malevolent opinions of her in the minds of right-thinking persons, while depriving her of friendly intercourse in society, thus injuring Justice Ling-Cohan’s good name and reputation.

56. The Post Defendants did not issue a retraction of the Libelous Articles and did not correct their numerous false statements, even after a majority of the Panelists themselves made clear that the defamatory statements were never uttered. To date, the Libelous Articles continue to be readily available on the NY Post.com and Nypostonline.com.

57. The Libelous Articles One, Two and Three were repeated by other media sources, including the Chinese press that translated the Articles almost verbatim, inflicting additional damage to Plaintiff in her community.

AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

58. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 58 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

59. Libelous Article One was published in the Metro Edition of the “New York Post” on August 31, 2016.

60. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article One in the Metro Edition of the “New York Post” on August 31, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to his position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter (should she so desire).

61. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

62. The publication of Libelous Article One in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017 was grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

63. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One, which directly, willfully and maliciously attacked the integrity of Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

64. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 63 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

65. Upon information and belief, Libelous Article One was published in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017.

66. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to

her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should he so desire.

67. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in his profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

68. The publication of Libelous Article One in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

69. By reason of the foregoing, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

70. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 69 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

71. Libelous Article One was published in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017.

72. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to

obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

73. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession, and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

74. The publication of Libelous Article One in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the "New York Post" on August 31, 2017 was grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

75. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One, which directly, willfully and maliciously attacked the integrity of Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

76. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 75 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

77. Libelous Article One was published on the Post Websites on August 31, 2017.

78. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One on the Post Websites on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be

appointed to higher judicial office, and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

79. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One on the Post Websites on August 31, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession, and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

80. The publication of Libelous Article One on the Post Websites on August 31, 2017 was grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

AS AND FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

81. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 80 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

82. Libelous Article Two was published in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2016.

83. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Two in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office, and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

84. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Two in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2017, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession, and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

85. The publication of Libelous Article Two of the Metro Edition in the "New York Post" on September August 31, 2017 was grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

AS AND FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

86. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 85 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

87. Libelous Article Two was published in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2016.

88. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Two in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter, should she so desire.

89. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Two in the Early edition of the "New York Post" on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice

Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession, and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

90. The publication of Libelous Article Two of the Early edition in the “New York Post” on September 6, 2016 was grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

91. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 90 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

92. Libelous Article Two was published in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 6, 2016.

93. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Two in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

94. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Two in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession, and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is

entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

95. The publication of Libelous Article Two in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on October 21, 2005 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, even after the libelous and defamatory statements were proven false, the Post Defendants stood behind the story and did not retract or removed the Libelous Articles from its website.

96. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article One, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

97. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 96 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

98. Libelous Article Two was published on the Post Websites on September 6, 2016.

99. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Two on the Post Websites on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

100. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Two on the Post Websites on September 6, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion,

shame and disgrace among others in her profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

101. The publication of Libelous Article Two on the Post Websites on September 6, 2016 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, by reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

102. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 101 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

103. Libelous Article Three was published in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 9, 2016

104. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Three in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

105. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Three in the Metro Edition of the "New York Post" on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt,

ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

106. The publication of Libelous Article Three of the Metro Edition in the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016, was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, by reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

107. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 106 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

108. Libelous Article Three was published in the Early edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016.

109. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three in the Early edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of her ability to obtain re-election to her position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should she so desire.

110. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three in the Early edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt,

ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

111. The publication of Libelous Article Three of the Early edition in the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, even after the New York State Office of Court Administration released Justice Ling-Cohan’s records demonstrating that her disposition of cases was above average, the Post Defendants did not retract the story. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR AN ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

112. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 111 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

113. Libelous Article Three was published in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016.

114. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of his ability to obtain re-election to his position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the private sector thereafter should he so desire.

115. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three in the Late

Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in her profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

116. The publication of Libelous Article Three in the Late Night/Sports Edition of the “New York Post” on September 9, 2016 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, even after the New York State Office of Court Administration released Justice Ling-Cohan’s records demonstrating that her disposition of cases was above average, the Post Defendants did not retract the story.

117. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

118. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 117 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

119. Libelous Article Three was published on the Post Websites on September 9, 2016.

120. By reason of the Post Defendants’ publication of Libelous Article Three on the Post Websites on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan sustained special damages, including but not limited to the prejudicing of his ability to obtain re-election to his position and to be appointed to higher judicial office and to obtain lucrative and prestigious positions in the

private sector thereafter should he so desire.

121. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article Three on the Post Websites on September 9, 2016, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation including, *inter alia*, that Justice Ling-Cohan has been brought into public scandal and disrepute, and has suffered contempt, ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace among others in his profession and among citizens of the State of New York, the nation and the world for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10,000,000.

122. The publication of Libelous Article Three on the Post Websites on September 9, 2016 was outrageous, grossly irresponsible, malicious and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. Indeed, even after the New York State Office of Court Administration released Justice Ling-Cohan's records demonstrating that her disposition of cases was above average, the Post Defendants did not retract the story.

123. By reason of the Post Defendants' publication of Libelous Article One, which directly, maliciously and willfully attacked the integrity and honesty of Justice Ling-Cohan, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against the Post Defendants.

AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

124. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 123 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

125. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer irreparable harm to her good name and reputation.

126. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

127. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction, mandating NYP to forthwith issue a retraction of Libelous Articles One, Two, Three and Four and to permanently remove them from its website.

AS AND FOR A FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

128. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 129 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

129. Upon information and belief, the Post Defendants obtained the information concerning Justice Ling-Cohan which was published in Libelous Articles One, Two and Three from John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10.

130. The information provided by John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 concerning Justice Ling-Cohan to the Post Defendants was slander and/or libel.

131. At the time, John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 transmitted the information concerning Justice Ling-Cohan to the Post Defendants, they knew that the information was completely false and inaccurate. Alternatively, John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 communicated the information concerning Justice Ling-Cohan to the Post Defendants with reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of their statements and with malicious intent. John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 knew and intended that the information they were providing to the Post Defendants would be published in Libelous Articles One, Two, Three, and Four.

132. By reason of the transmittal by John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 of the information concerning Justice Ling-Cohan to the Post Defendants, Justice Ling-Cohan has been, and continues to be, greatly injured in name and reputation, and has suffered contempt and ridicule, aversion, shame and disgrace, for which Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to recover an amount not less than \$10 million.

133. The malicious transmittal of the completely false and defamatory information concerning Justice Ling-Cohan by John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 to the Post Defendants, which was thereafter published in Libelous Articles One, Two, Three and Four, was outrageous and evinced a complete and utter indifference to the rights and reputation of Justice Ling-Cohan. By reason thereof, Justice Ling-Cohan is entitled to an award of punitive damages against John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Doris Ling-Cohan prays:

- A. On her First through Twelfth Causes of Action, (i) for compensatory damages against the Post Defendants in the amount of \$10,000,000, together with punitive damages in the amount of an additional \$10,000,000;
- B. On her Thirteenth Cause of Action, a permanent mandatory injunction, directing NYP to retract the defamatory statement from Libelous Article One, Two and Three and to permanently remove those articles from its website.
- C. On her Fourteenth Cause of Action, for compensatory damages against John and/or Jane Doe 1 through 10 in the amount of \$10,000,000, together with punitive damages in the amount of an additional \$10,000,000;

D. On all Causes of Action, such other and further relief as may seem just and proper,
including the costs and disbursements of this action.

Dated: New York, New York
August 30, 2017

CARABALLO & MANDELL, PLLC,

By: 

Dolly Caraballo
Attorney's for Plaintiff
261 Madison Avenue, Fl. 26
New York, NY 10017
(212) 213-8860
Dolly@Caramanlaw.com

VERIFICATION

State of New York)
)ss.:
County of New York)

Doris Ling-Cohan, being duly sworn, deposes and says that deponent is the plaintiff in the within complaint; that deponent has read the complaint and knows the contents thereof; and that the same is true to deponent’s own knowledge, except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and that as to those matters deponent believes them to be true.


Doris Ling-Cohan

Sworn to before me this

30 day of August 2017


Notary Public

REBECCA I. WOHL
Notary Public, State of New York
Reg. No. 02WO6340934
Qualified in Kings County
My Commission Expires 5-2-2020