

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

07 CV 11612


-----x
LUISA C. ESPOSITO,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. _____

-against-

THE STATE OF NEW YORK, THE OFFICE OF COURT
ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM,
THOMAS J. CAHILL, in his official and
individual capacity, NAOMI GOLDSTEIN, in her official
and individual capacity, ALBERT S. BLINDER,
in his official and individual capacity,
HARVEY GLADSTEIN & PARTNERS LLC
f/k/a GLADSTEIN & ISAAC, and
ALLEN H. ISAAC, individually and as a partner of
HARVEY GLADSTEIN & PARTNERS LLC f/k/a
GLADSTEIN & ISAAC, JOHN and JANE DOES,



Defendants.
-----x

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF LUISA C. ESPOSITO, Pro Se, as and for her Complaint against the above-captioned defendants, alleges upon knowledge as to her own facts and upon information and belief as to all other matters:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This is a civil action seeking injunctive relief, monetary relief, compensatory and punitive damages, disbursements, costs and fees for violations of rights, brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983; the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and State law claims.

2. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that all of the above-captioned defendants wantonly, recklessly, knowingly and purposefully, acting individually and in conspiracy with each other,

sought to deprive Plaintiff of her Constitutional rights, by means of misrepresentation, fraud, harassment, manipulation of laws, rules, and regulations and for various other reasons. Plaintiff read in *The New York Times*, an article by Paul Vitello, regarding a former attorney-employee at the New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department's Departmental Disciplinary Committee ("DDC"), a Ms. Christine C. Anderson, who had filed a \$10 million complaint against the DDC in U.S.D.C., S.D.N.Y., regarding "white-washing" of complaints against certain select attorneys for "political reasons."

3. Plaintiff also specifically brings claims against defendants Allen H. Isaac (in his individual capacity and in his capacity as a partner of Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac) and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, for alleged assault and battery, breach of contract, and breach of fiduciary duties.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §§1343(3) and (4), and the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Pendent jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

5. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983, because Defendant the State of New York is a "state actor" within the meaning of §1983; and the Office of Court Administration of the Unified Court System, New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, is an arm of the State of New York and a "state actor" within the meaning of § 1983.

6. Venue herein is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b); the cause of action arose in the Southern District of New York, all of the parties reside or are located in the State of New York, and because the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this judicial district.

THE PARTIES

7. At all times relevant in this Complaint, Plaintiff is an individual white Caucasian woman of Italian descent, residing in the State of New York. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was a complainant and witness in a pending Grievance complaint before the DDC against her former attorney, Allen H. Isaac, Esq. (Docket No. 2005.3074).

8. At all times relevant to this Complaint, upon information and belief, Defendant Allen H. Isaac, Esq. (hereinafter "Isaac") is an individual residing in the State of New York, and a partner in defendant law firm Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac.

9. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, is a domestic professional service limited liability company, providing legal services to the public, located at 110 Wall Street, New York, New York 10005.

10. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant STATE OF NEW YORK (hereinafter "State") is a sovereign state of the United States of America. At all times relevant herein, Defendant State was an employer within the meaning of the Constitution of the State of New York and was a Governmental entity acting under color of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs and usages of the State of New York.

11. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM, New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department (hereinafter "OCA") is and was at all relevant times a governmental entity created by and authorized under the laws of the State of New York. At all times relevant herein, Defendant OCA was a governmental entity acting under color of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs and usages of the State of New York.

12. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant Naomi Goldstein (hereinafter "Goldstein") (white female), sued in her official and individual capacity, was upon information and belief, a citizen of the United States, residing in the State of New York. At all times relevant herein, Defendant Goldstein was the prosecuting attorney regarding Plaintiff's complaint against defendant Isaac.

13. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant Thomas J. Cahill (hereinafter "Cahill") (white male), sued here in his official and individual capacity, is an attorney, who, under information and belief, resides in the State of Connecticut. At all times relevant herein, Defendant Cahill was employed as Chief Counsel for the DDC; was a policy maker for administrative and employment-related matters at the DDC; and was an employer within the meaning of the Constitution of the State of New York.

14. At all times relevant in this Complaint, Defendant Referee Albert S. Blinder (hereinafter "Blinder") (white male), sued herein in his official and individual capacity, is a retired judge employed by the DDC to sit as a referee in the complaint against Isaac. Upon information and belief, Blinder resides in the State of New York.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Sexual Assault

15. Upon information and belief, on or about June 2005, Plaintiff met with the law firm of Gladstein & Isaac, now known as Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, to represent her in a legal matter resulting from a car accident. In furtherance of this meeting, and for the purpose of trial

preparation, on or about July 8, 2005, Plaintiff met with Isaac at the law offices of Gladstein & Isaac, located at 110 Wall Street, New York, New York 10005.

16. On or about July 8, 2005, during this meeting, Isaac sexually assaulted Plaintiff without cause or provocation, by reaching his hand inside Plaintiff's bra and grabbing her left breast without her permission, upon leaving Isaac's office she immediately told her friend about the assault done by Mr. Isaac. Mr. Isaac called Plaintiff later that day and told Plaintiff "if she tells anyone what he had done to her, he would no longer represent Plaintiff in her case". He said, "I have to be able to trust you, you keep your mouth shut". Following this incident, Isaac continually telephoned Plaintiff, and asked her to compile a list of "Graphic Sex Acts" that she could no longer perform as a result of her accident, such as, "DO YOU LIKE TO BEND OVER DURING ANAL SEX"; "DO YOU LIKE TO GIVE ORAL SEX"? Isaac wanted to know every personal, sexual detail of Plaintiff's life. Isaac asked Plaintiff "to send him sexy pictures of her to his home, along with the list of graphic sex acts." He said "Mark it Personal and Confidential" -- "I will then extrapolate all the "HARDCORE STUFF" and "I will use what I want to use, and how I want to use it, and then I will put it in a softer version." Plaintiff taped a number of these telephone conversations.

17. On another occasion, on or about September 16, 2005, Isaac locked Plaintiff in his office and demanded that she try on clothing in front of him. Isaac, after hanging up on a telephone call, came up from behind Plaintiff and grabbed both of her breasts, and said "GREAT TITS." Isaac proceeded to tell Plaintiff that "He wanted something in return for taking her case on." He told Plaintiff "Nobody gets something for nothing in this world." Isaac then asked Plaintiff twice, "What do you think I want from you?" Plaintiff did not know the answer. Isaac

then stated: "I WANT A BLOW JOB FROM YOU" – "TWO BEFORE I EVEN TRY YOUR CASE." Plaintiff asked, "If I don't comply with your demands?" Isaac replied: "Go home and think about it and let me know what you decide." Plaintiff suffers from Crohn's Disease, and became violently ill. As she was leaving the office, Isaac grabbed Plaintiff's buttocks. This physical assault was witnessed by someone in Isaac's office at Gladstein & Isaac, and by Faith Wyckoff. After this sexual assault, Isaac contacted Plaintiff and told her "If she told anyone what he had done to her that he would no longer represent her on her case."

Plaintiff Files a Complaint with the DDC

18. On or about October or November 2005, Plaintiff filed a Grievance complaint with the DDC against Isaac, complaining about "Alleged Sexual Abuse", "Professional Misconduct", among other state and federal violations. Plaintiff also filed a report with the police. Plaintiff's complaint with the DDC was handled by Naomi Goldstein, an attorney with the DDC. Plaintiff submitted a number of her taped telephone conversations to the DDC and Goldstein in support of her complaint. On or about October 7, 2005, a private investigator wired Plaintiff and there was produced a 1-Hour and 49-minute DVD Audio-Video tape of Isaac's admissions to sexually assaulting Plaintiff. On this DVD Audio/Video tape, Isaac demands sexual favors in return for legal representation, and also discusses getting favors from Judges on his cases and on Plaintiff's case. **(A copy of this DVD-A/V tape and transcript is attached hereto as Exhibit A.)**

19. Between 2006 through 2007, defendant Goldstein had been contacting Plaintiff via telephone, to interview her, regarding her complaint against Isaac. Defendant Goldstein indicated to Plaintiff that Isaac had been deposed and charged with very serious charges, which

she could not reveal to Plaintiff. After numerous alleged interviews with Isaac, Goldstein told Plaintiff, "If Mr. Isaac does not get disbarred, she is going to quit her job at the DDC."

Goldstein told Plaintiff, "Mr. Isaac is a disgrace to the legal profession." Defendant Goldstein told Plaintiff that the "DDC had asked Mr. Isaac to hand in his law license with admissions to sexually and physically abusing Plaintiff."

20. At some point, however, Goldstein changed her attitude towards Isaac, and towards Plaintiff. For example, Plaintiff, on numerous occasions, asked defendant Goldstein if she could have her attorney, Jeffrey Lisabeth, Esq., be present with her during the Grievance hearings, in order to protect her interests. Defendant Goldstein told Plaintiff "She is not allowed legal representation during these hearings."

21. The DDC hearings against Isaac began in April 2007. Defendant Goldstein asked Plaintiff to arrive early, so that she could brief Plaintiff with respect with respect to her "direct testimony." Then in April 2007, defendant Goldstein began direct testimony with Plaintiff still not being allowed to be accompanied by her attorney, or for that matter, anyone else.

22. At another meeting, prior to testifying on direct, defendant Goldstein wanted Plaintiff to listen to the taped telephone conversations and transcripts, regarding Isaac and Plaintiff. Defendant Goldstein told Plaintiff to "Testify under oath that the telephone tapes and transcripts were authentic and to attest to their accuracy." Goldstein then handed Plaintiff's the DDC's transcription, transcribed by a Carole Ludwig on June 21, 2006, purportedly of the 1-hour 49-minute DVD Audio-Video tape which consisted of Isaac's admissions. Goldstein told Plaintiff to "read it," and that she, Plaintiff, would be listening to the DVD Audio-video tape along with the Court, Isaac and his attorneys.

Plaintiff Discovers Corruption at the DDC

23. After reviewing the DDC's transcription of the 1-hour and 49-minute DVD A/V tape, Plaintiff realized that it had significant errors and omissions pertaining to critical conversations. Plaintiff pointed these errors out to Goldstein and told Goldstein that she was not going to perjure herself under oath, after reading their so-called "fudged" transcript. Goldstein replied that the transcriber who prepared the transcription may have been deaf. Plaintiff later left the hearings after falling gravely ill. Plaintiff returned to the DDC to retrieve her telephone tapes from Goldstein, since Goldstein had previously promised that they would be returned by the end of the day. Despite numerous requests, Plaintiff never received her tapes. Goldstein told Plaintiff, "I cannot return them to you." Plaintiff discussed with Goldstein that she had thought that she could trust her, and now, after seeing and experiencing what was going on in the hearings, her feelings had changed. During their meeting, Goldstein called in a Nicole Corrado, another attorney with the DDC, and a gentleman in control of the tape recorder during the hearing. Plaintiff discussed the DVD A/V transcript and errors and wanted to listen to the tape. Plaintiff asked Ms. Corrado if she could get a copy of the DDC's transcript. Ms. Corrado gave Plaintiff a copy of the DDC's copy of the DVD A/V transcript. Defendant Goldstein appeared annoyed that Ms. Corrado had given Plaintiff a copy.

24. On May 1, 2007, Plaintiff wrote numerous letters to the Court, Judge Judith Kaye, Goldstein, Cahill and Blinder, pointing out the numerous errors regarding the DDC's transcript and asking, "why are they not allowing her attorney to attend the hearings." Plaintiff asked Goldstein to "Point out where it is written [in the DDC's rules] that Plaintiff could not have an attorney present to protect her interests." Defendant Goldstein did not address Plaintiff's letters.

Plaintiff also asked Goldstein in her numerous letters, why Goldstein was not calling in Plaintiff's witnesses to corroborate her complaints against Isaac; and why was Goldstein not submitting all of the telephone tapes of Isaac and Plaintiff. For example, Plaintiff learned that an intern who worked for Isaac had reported to a CBS News Investigator reporter, Scott Weinberger, that what happened to Plaintiff was not an isolated incident, but Goldstein was not calling in that intern to testify. In addition, Plaintiff's out-cry witness, Diane Purhagen, was not being called in to testify as a witness. Plaintiff also asked "Why the Police Report was not being entered into evidence." Plaintiff received no response.

25. Plaintiffs' Crohn's disease worsened (as it is exacerbated by stress); she was hospitalized twice as a result. Plaintiff frequently cannot sleep or eat and she suffers from severe abdominal pain, frequent bloody bowel movements, anxiety and panic attacks and fears for her safety. That all began as a direct result of Isaac's sexual assaults, extortionate demands, and coercion tactics; that illness has escalated further, because of the DDC's failure to protect Plaintiff's Constitutional rights by denying Plaintiff access to a fair court system, denying plaintiff her right to legal representation, denying plaintiff due process of law, among other humiliating tactics and abuses, as detailed below. Plaintiff reported all of these violations and requested a fair court system, but upon information and belief, all parties were conspiring to protect Isaac.

The DDC's Sham Proceedings

26. In May 2007, Goldstein, the Court, Isaac and Isaac's attorneys (Richard Godosky and Michael Ross) listened to the DVD A/V tape outside of Plaintiff's presence, after Goldstein had instructed Plaintiff to "testify to its accuracy and the Plaintiff would be listening to the DVD,

that day after testifying.” In fact, Plaintiff had never heard the tape that her former attorney had submitted to the court. When Plaintiff asked Blinder if she could listen to the DVD tape together with the assembled body, Blinder told her: “You are only a witness, you are not going to waste the Court’s time, or my time, no.”

27. On or about May 3, 2007, on direct with Goldstein and cross-examination by Isaac’s attorney Richard Godosky, Goldstein told Plaintiff: “Plaintiff could not bring her papers or folder into the hearing room and then warned her not to bring anything in with her.” Nevertheless, Plaintiff brought her folder in. Goldstein took Plaintiff’s folder and placed it on the floor, then Godosky took Plaintiff’s folder and said, “What’s this your Honor? I want this submitted into evidence.” Godosky did that, submitting Plaintiff’s folder as “Respondent’s Exhibit.” Plaintiff was never allowed access to her folder; nor

was she allowed to have an attorney accompany her – even though Isaac was permitted to have two attorneys present.

28. Plaintiff also requested of Blinder numerous times, to permit her to be accompanied by her counsel. Blinder refused. He stated, “If you want your lawyer here, he could sit in the hall, but he’s not allowed in these proceedings.” Upon information and belief, defendant Blinder is a retired judge, and as a result, he is well aware of Plaintiff’s rights, yet he willingly participated in unethical behavior, designed to deprive Plaintiff of her constitutional rights. Plaintiff is forced to inquire: were there any “conflicts of interest” regarding Blinder and Isaac?

29. Plaintiff submitted numerous telephone tapes to the Court, and read the transcripts of the telephone conversations. Plaintiff realized that on one of the telephone tapes, the beginning of the tape had been erased. Plaintiff pointed that fact to Goldstein, who responded, “Oh, Luisa, just do it, testify to its accuracy.” Despite the DDC’s possession of various complete accurate tapes, supplied by Plaintiff, Goldstein “cherry-picked” those she felt she wanted to submit into evidence, and submitted a tape that Plaintiff believed had been doctored. Plaintiff was horrified. By the end of the day, Plaintiff could literally not breathe, because she was crying so hard after witnessing the DDC’s sham proceedings; and after suffering their repeated violation of her constitutional rights.

30. Plaintiff’s doctor had concerns regarding her health. He submitted several letters pertaining to Plaintiff’s medical condition, which described her severe bouts of bloody bowel movements, severe abdominal cramping, and fevers. Plaintiff’s gastroenterologist stated in his letters that Plaintiff “could not return to testify until her medical condition stabilized” and did not

want her health at risk. His letters were apparently not good enough for Goldstein, however, because she sought Plaintiff's entire medical file and notes from her doctor. Plaintiff did not understand why she was being treated in this fashion or why Goldstein would want or need her entire medical file. Plaintiff would not permit the release of her doctor's office notes and records. Yet Goldstein further harassed Plaintiff for her doctor's medical records through several faxed letters and first class mail. Goldstein also demanded that Plaintiff's doctor submit results of stool specimen tests and other personal medical information Plaintiff believed was protected by the doctor-patient relationship. Goldstein continually harassed Plaintiff about returning to testify after Plaintiff expressed her concerns about the way the hearings were being conducted. Plaintiff felt abused; she explained that she believed the hearing were "flawed" and "unethical" and asked why they did not permit her attorney to be present during the proceedings.

31. Hearings at the DDC were adjourned until September 25, 2007. Prior to that date, Goldstein contacted Plaintiff on several occasions, asking for letters and records of personal medical files, and asking Plaintiff to return to the DDC on September 25, 2007, to complete her cross-examination. Plaintiff was unable to do so on account of the condition of her health; also, because she was being denied the presence of her attorney. Plaintiff felt as though she was being treated like she a criminal – being denied counsel; being repeatedly harassed by Goldstein; and because of Goldstein's invasive demands for her personal medical files. Plaintiff felt as though she was being victimized again; after having being sexually assaulted by Isaac, in seeking justice through the DDC, she was instead harassed, lied to, and demeaned.

32. Plaintiff reported the "flawed" and "unethical" conduct that had occurred procedures in several letters to Cahill and others. Nevertheless, Plaintiff's complaints were once

again, bounced around and dismissed. Cahill did nothing to further the interests of justice on behalf of the Court and specifically, his agency, the DDC. Upon information and belief, Cahill was asked to retire and is under investigation.

33. Upon information and belief, all defendants conspired with each other and agreed with each other to act in concert to deny Plaintiff of a fair court hearing and to deny Plaintiff her rights to due process and equal protection of the laws.

COUNT ONE
(All Defendants)
42 U.S.C. §1983
DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS and
CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE RIGHTS UNDER
THE FIRST and FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS

34. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 34 as though fully set forth herein.

35. As set forth above, the DDC is a division of the New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, and is therefore part of the New York State court system. As part of the New York State court system, the DDC is obligated to administer justice in a fair and honest manner.

36. The DDC is also an arm of the State of New York and a "state actor" within the meaning of § 1983. Defendants Cahill, Goldstein, and Blinder are also "state actors" under § 1983.

37. Plaintiff has a Constitutional right to a fair and honest judicial system, free from corruption and bias, with impartial arbiters of the law. Through the conduct set forth above, including but not limited to their conduct in denying Plaintiff access to fair and honest court proceedings, all defendants, collectively and each one of them individually, have engaged in

actions and abuses which violate and deny Plaintiff of her Constitutional rights, including her rights to due process and equal protection of the law, as provided under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

38. Through the conduct set forth above, including but not limited to their conduct in denying Plaintiff access to fair and honest court proceedings, all defendants, collectively and each one of them individually, have engaged in actions and abuses which violate and deny Plaintiff of her Constitutional rights, including her right to petition the government under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

39. As a direct and proximate result of said acts, because Crohn's disease is exacerbated by stress, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe symptoms of her Crohns Disease, fear, panic attacks and anxiety attacks, extreme loss of security in the Legal System and Judicial Process, she suffers from shame, embarrassment, insecurities, emotional pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, and loss of trust of lawyers and in the Court system.

40. As a result of the Defendants denying Plaintiff's rights, Plaintiff is now and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages, as well as damages for mental anguish, and humiliation. Plaintiff is entitled to damages in the amount of twenty million dollars (\$20, 000, 000 ,00) dollars as well as punitive damages, costs, and possible attorneys' fees for these violations.

COUNT TWO
(Defendants Allen H. Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC)
BREACH OF CONTRACT

41. Plaintiff repeats and reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 40 as though fully set forth herein.

42. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff entered into a legal and binding contract with defendant law firm Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, for legal representation of her car accident case. Plaintiff met with defendant Isaac, a partner in that law firm, for the purpose of pursuing her legal matter. Rather than properly advising her, however, Isaac instead allegedly sexually assaulted Plaintiff, demanded sexual favors in exchange for his legal representation, and conducted himself toward Plaintiff in a threatening and coercive manner. As a partner of the firm Gladstein & Isaac, liability for Isaac's conduct is imputed to the firm.

43. By the actions set forth above, defendants Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC breached their contract to provide legal representation to Plaintiff, and are therefore liable to Plaintiff for damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT THREE
(Defendants Allen H. Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC)
BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

44. Plaintiff repeats and reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 43 as though fully set forth herein.

45. As a client of defendant law firm Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, the law firm and its partners owed Plaintiff fiduciary duties of good faith, loyalty, and care.

46. When Isaac allegedly sexually assaulted Plaintiff, however, both Isaac and the law firm breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiff. As a partner of the firm Gladstein & Isaac,

liability for Isaac's conduct is imputed to the firm. As a result, defendants Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, are liable to Plaintiff for damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

COUNT FOUR
(Defendants Allen H. Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC)
ASSAULT

47. Plaintiff repeats and reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 46 as though fully set forth herein.

48. When Isaac allegedly sexually assaulted Plaintiff, he committed the intentional tort of assault against her. As a partner of the firm Gladstein & Isaac, liability for Isaac's conduct is imputed to the firm. As a result, defendants Isaac and Harvey Gladstein & Partners LLC, formerly known as Gladstein & Isaac, are liable to Plaintiff for damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment and an Order in favor as follows:

- a. First Cause of Action: in excess of twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollars as well as punitive damages, costs and attorney's fees.

- b. ~~Second Cause of Action: in excess of twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollars as well as punitive damages, costs and attorney's fees.~~
- c. Third Cause of Action: in excess of twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollars as well as punitive damages, costs and attorney's fees.
- d. Fourth Cause of Action: in excess of twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollars as well as punitive damages, costs and attorney's fees.
- e. Awarding Plaintiff punitive damages against all individual defendants;
- f. Appointing a federal monitor to oversee the day-to-day operations of the DDC for an indefinite period of time; and

- g. An Order granting such other legal and equitable relief as the court deems just and proper.

JURY TRIAL IS DEMANDED


Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Dated: West Hempstead, New York
December 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

LUISA C. ESPOSITO

By:



LUISA ESPOSITO Pro Se
571 Koy Street
West Hempstead, N.Y. 11552
(516) 741-0320