Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division: Second Judicial Department

M250296 E/afa

WILLIAM F. MASTRO, J.P. SHERI S. ROMAN COLLEEN D. DUFFY VALERIE BRATHWAITE NELSON, JJ.

2017-12066

DECISION & ORDER ON MOTION

In the Matter of Suzanne McCrory, et al., appellants, v Village of Mamaroneck Board of Trustees, respondent.

(Index No. 1772/17)

Motion by the appellant Suzanne McCrory pro se on an appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Westchester County, dated September 22, 2017, to waive compliance with the requirements of 22 NYCRR 670.10.2(f) regarding certification of the record on appeal and, in effect, pursuant to 22 NYCRR 670.10.2(b)(6)(ii) to dispense with reproducing certain exhibits. Separate motion by the respondent for leave to file late papers in opposition to the motion by the appellant Suzanne McCrory pro se.

Upon the papers filed in support of the motion by the appellant Suzanne McCrory pro se and the papers filed in opposition thereto, and upon the papers filed in support of the motion by the respondent and no papers having been filed in opposition thereto, it is

ORDERED that the branch of the motion by the appellant Suzanne McCrory pro se which is, in effect, pursuant to 22 NYCRR 670.10.2(b)(6)(ii) to dispense with reproducing certain exhibits is denied; and it is further,

ORDERED that on or before June 20, 2018, the appellants shall serve and file a supplemental record containing Exhibits A through V to the Agostino A. Fusco affidavit dated June 23, 2017, and relabel the table of contents entry and the header document label of the copies of the record filed with the Clerk of this Court concerning pages 112 and 113 to reflect that those pages contain the reply affidavit of Agostino A. Fusco dated July 14, 2017; and it is further,

ORDERED that the branch of the motion by the appellant Suzanne McCrory pro se which is to waive compliance with the requirements of 22 NYCRR 670.10.2(f) regarding

May 18, 2018 Page 1. MATTER OF McCRORY v VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK BOARD OF TRUSTEES

certification of the record is denied with leave to renew by a motion made simultaneously with the filing of the supplemental record; and it is further,

ORDERED that the motion by the respondent is granted.

MASTRO, J.P., ROMAN, DUFFY and BRATHWAITE NELSON, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Clerk of the Court

May 18, 2018 Page 2.