Candice Lue

[redacted]

February 18, 2017

United States District Court
of the Southern District of New York
Pro Se Intake Unit
Daniel Patrick Moynihan
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, Room 200
New York, New York 10007

RE: Civil Action No.: 16 CV 3207 (AJN) (GWG) – Answer/Explanation per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of 2/14/2017 (Docket Entry # 67) - In order to preserve the integrity of the judiciary…"

CANDICE LUE, an individual,

Plaintiff,

V.

JPMORGAN CHASE & CO., a Delaware Corporation; ALEX KHAVIN, an individual; FIDELIA SHILLINGFORD, an individual; JOHN VEGA, an individual; HELEN DUBOWY, an individual; PHILIPPE QUIX, an individual; THOMAS POZ, an individual; CHRIS LIASIS, an individual; MICHELLE SULLIVAN, an individual; and DOES 1 - 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find attached my "Answer/Explanation per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of 2/14/2017 (docket entry # 67) - In order to preserve the integrity of the judiciary…", emails dated January 21, 2017 and January 28, 2017, the first pages of the documents entered as docket entries # 64 and 66 on the docket and the Affirmation of Service form duly completed and signed representing service of this Answer/Explanation to Defendants' attorneys, Robert S. Whitman and Anshel Kaplan.

Respectfully,

Candice S.M. Lue

Candice Lue

Attachments: "Answer/Explanation per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of 2/14/2017 (docket entry # 67)", emails dated January 21, 2017 and January 28, 2017, the first pages of the documents entered as docket entries # 64 and 66 on the docket and Affirmation of Service

Copy: Clerk's Office, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Certificate of Mailing

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK

CANDICE LUE, an individual,

Plaintiff

V.

JPMORGAN CHASE & CO. a Delaware Corporation; ALEX KHAVIN, an individual; FIDELIA SHILLINGFORD, an individual; JOHN VEGA, an individual; HELEN DUBOWY, an individual; PHILIPPE QUIX, an individual; THOMAS POZ, an individual; CHRIS LIASIS, an individual; MICHELLE SULLIVAN, an individual; and DOES 1 - 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Civil Action No.: 16 CV 3207 (AJN) (GWG)

ANSWER/EXPLANATION
per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's
Order of 2/14/2017 (Docket Entry # 67)
- In order to preserve the integrity of the judiciary, and to ensure that justice is carried out in each individual case, judges must adhere to high standards of conduct.

I. STATEMENT

In reference to my "Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017" filed on January 31, 2017 (Docket # 66), in Judge Gorenstein's Order of February 14, 2017, he cited the first sentence of my caption that says, "*the short notice for the Conference that [this Court] ordered is utterly inconvenient and financially burdensome for me to attend*" and further commented that "*that motion asked in the alternative that this Conference be held on February 10, 2017, or later. ("With that said, I respectfully ask that the Court postpone this Conference to February 10, 2017 or sometime thereafter.") Accordingly, on February 1, 2017, the Court rescheduled the Conference for February 10, 2017, at 10:00 am.*"

However, while Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's citation consisted of only two sentences out of the four (4) pages of my "Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017" filed on January 31, 2017 (Docket # 66), throughout the whole said document as well as in my

"Motion to Deny Defendants' Attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Request for Local Rule 37.2 Conference" dated January 25, 2017 which the said judge denied (docket entries 64 and 65), my sentiment was as summed up in the "**CONCLUSION**" which stated: "*In accordance with the foregoing, I respectfully see the Order by Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein granting this Local Rule 37.2 Conference to be a façade for granting Attorney, Anshel Kaplan favors out of the public's* [immediate] *view and ask that in the interest of promotion of public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary, this scheduled Conference be cancelled.*" I will also respectfully add that the judge should have known that issuing a Court Order on January 27, 2017 for a February 3, 2017 civil action appearance (within less than ten (10) days), if I am not mistaken, should only happen under extraordinary circumstances or never happen.

II. ARGUMENT

Discovery disputes must be handled during the discovery period. The discovery period as per the last 60 day extension that was granted by Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein to the Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan ended on January 31, 2017 (docket entry # 58) and no further extension was requested by or granted to the said attorney by the Court after I denied his request to consent to an additional 30 day extension as per my attached email dated January 21, 2017.

As is explicitly stated in Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of July 20, 2016, "*All discovery (including requests for admission and any applications to the Court with respect to the conduct of discovery) must be initiated in time to be concluded by the deadline for all discovery..... Any application for an extension of the time limitations herein must be made as soon as the cause for the extension becomes known to the party making the application.*" Also, as it relates to discovery motions, the said Order further states that, "*absent extraordinary circumstances no such application will be considered if made later than 30 days prior to the close of discovery. Untimely applications will be denied.*" However, as is obvious and based on the track record of this case per

the Court's docket entries, these rules only apply to me, poor, Black pro se Plaintiff, Candice Lue and not to the multi-billion dollar Defendants, JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al.

First off, there is nothing extraordinary about Attorney Anshel Kaplan's application for the Local Rule 37.2 Conference which he requested on January 24, 2017, **seven (7) days** "*prior to the close of discovery*". As I stated in my "Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017" (docket entry # 66 – which was hidden under docket entry # 65 on the PacerMonitor website before it was removed), the said attorney "*is merely seeking another favor from the court (which I do not have access to) and is trying to conceal such favor from* [immediate] *public view considering the fact that the Court/Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein had just granted the said attorney a 60 day extension to January 31, 2017.*"

Based on the "favors" requested in Attorney Anshel Kaplan's Letter Motion of January 24, 2017, all the said attorney needed to do was to ask the Court for an additional 30 day extension of time as he did in his docket entry # 57 and if granted, file a "Motion to Compel" for the Court to compel me to sign releases and authorizations (which based on the statutes under which this lawsuit is filed can be deemed unconstitutional) and to compel me to provide answers to "Defendants Second Set of Interrogatories" which I had already provided - Bearing in mind that the said attorney has not provided one substantive answer to any of my eighteen (18) "First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants" for which I had unsuccessfully sought the Court's help via a "Motion to Compel" that I filed with the Court and which was entered on the Court's docket as of October 7, 2016 but which, of course, was denied by Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein because, ironically, I did not comply with Paragraph 2A of his Individual Practices – as I stated previously "*these rules only apply to me*".

A Local Rule 37.2 Conference was not needed to request an additional 30 day extension of time for discovery or to compel me "*to execute the requested releases and provide documents relating to those earnings and efforts, regardless of date, since January 7, 2016*" as requested in Attorney Anshel Kaplan's Letter Motion. With that said, anyone of reasonable thinking can see that

this conference was just a façade to conceal from the public's immediate view applications to the Court which are supposed to be entered on the public docket for the public to see Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein granting the favored, multi-billion dollar Defendants an additional 30 day extension of time for discovery (even though the Court had just granted them a 60 day extension to 1/31/2017) and God forbid, granting the said Defendants' request to compel me to execute requests for releases/authorizations which are either unconstitutional based on the nature of this lawsuit/the statutes under which this lawsuit is filed and/or have no potential relevance to Plaintiff's claims or to the Defendants' defenses and as such, are disproportionate to the Defendants' legitimate discovery needs. There is **nothing** pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and/or 42 U.S.C. § 1981 ("Section 1981") that makes the demand for these releases/authorizations relevant.

Besides the fact that in his docket entry # 62, Attorney Anshel Kaplan did not state the reason as to why he was requesting the Local Rule 37.2 Conference for the public to see, there is nothing in his Letter Motion about "*a conference to discuss the discovery dispute raised*" as per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's docket entry # 63. Meaning, that both docket entries 62 and 63 are not only misleading to the public's immediate view but they are façades. Everything in the said attorney's Letter Motion was to compel, compel, compel, nothing about discussing. And again, based on the Court's docket track record of Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein, who I had previously motioned for his recusal due to bias (docket entries 25 and 26) and requested in my Petition for Issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (Docket Number: 16 – 3873) that his Orders be vacated due to bias, anyone of reasonable mind could have predicted the results of this Conference – everything for the Defendants - granted, granted, granted.

The short notice of less than ten (10) days after Judge Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017 was issued for me to appear in court on February 3, 2017 was solely to facilitate the fact that the discovery period was ending on January 31, 2017 and since the multi-billion dollar, favored Defendants did not want their request for another 30 day extension appearing in the public's

immediate view by way of a docket entry, along with the Court, the Conference was scheduled as close as possible to January 31, 2017 thus, the initial Conference date schedule of February 3, 2017.

The Court/Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein and the Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan were in such a rush to get this conference in as close as possible to the **past** end of discovery deadline of January 31, 2017 (which makes it invalid per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's own Order of July 20, 2016) that the said judge directed the Defendants' attorney to email a copy of his Order of February 1, 2017 rescheduling the conference to February 10, 2017 to me "*to ensure its timely receipt*". This Order of February 1, 2017 (docket entry # 65) is another façade or, with all due respect, as Former Vice President, Joe Biden would say, "*Malarkey*".

The deputy clerk did not have to ask "*counsel to fax the letter to Chambers because there was no copy of that letter in Chambers or on the ECF system*" (let me respectfully say that this was not a "letter", it was a Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017) because as per the United States Postal Service (USPS), my Response was estimated to be delivered at 500 Pearl Street, New York, NY 10007 on Monday, January 30, 2017 and per "SC's" docket entry # 66, the said Response was in the Pro Se Intake Unit on Tuesday, January 31, 2017. So, a call on **February 1, 2017** by the deputy clerk to the Pro Se Intake Unit **not** a request for the Defendants' counsel to send a fax would have yielded the same results. However, the difference would be that Judge Gorenstein's Order of February 1, 2017 would have to be sent by mail to me, not via email through the Defendants' attorney, thus jeopardizing "*its timely receipt*" and this conference needed to be done as close as possible to the **already past** end of discovery deadline of January 31, 2017. With regards to the aforesaid, I respectfully ask that the Court does not abuse my personal email by using it as an appeasement for its favored, multi-billion dollar Defendants, JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al. Furthermore, what judge in the judicial system makes a ruling on a Response to a Court's Order based on a fax that counsel to one of the parties sends to him/her? Shouldn't the judge be making a ruling on a Response to a Court's Order that has actually been

filed with the Court? And, per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of February 1, 2017, "*there was no copy of that letter* [Response] *in Chambers or on the ECF system*".

In addition, based on the fact that the said judge's Order of February 14, 2017 was surprisingly sent to me via my personal email by the Defendants' attorney, I respectfully ask that all correspondence from the Court be sent to me directly and not be sent to me via the Defendants' attorney as I consider this to be TOTAL BULLYING (also see email dated 1/28/2017 attached) by both the Court and its favored, multi-billion dollar Defendants to facilitate an **already past** end of discovery deadline. The Court must allow enough time for US mail delivery when it comes to setting Court dates to ensure timely receipts, not to appease the favored parties to the case by abusing my personal email especially when for security reasons I usually do not open attachments sent to me from anyone. And, it is for those said security reasons why I have no interest in ECF.

As a member of the public, let me respectfully say that I have made it obvious that I do have concerns about the integrity of this judiciary. I also do believe and it has been made obvious to me by way of my last two submissions to the court (docket entries # 64 and 66) that as a poor, Black, pro se Plaintiff with a lawsuit against a powerful, multi-billion dollar corporation, my submissions to the Court are scrutinized and/or at times delayed before they are entered on the docket for the public's immediate view. I would have appreciated, just like docket entries 65 and 67, if the **full texts** (see attached) of the statements I have to the right on the first pages of the documents I submitted to the Court and which have been entered on the Court's docket as docket entries # 64 and 66 were entered as such for the public's immediate view instead of the abbreviated entry. The omission of my full texts was obviously done to conceal from the public's immediate view the **true nature** of the Defendants' attorney Letter Motion for the Local Rule 37.2 Conference while docket entries 65 and 67 are put on full blast to distort my public image.

In addition, I find it curious that "SC" from the Pro Se Intake Unit (separate and apart from Judge Gorenstein's Chambers) who has entered all my other Responses as "Respoth/Response

(non-motion)" on the docket, for my "Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017", as per docket entry # 66, he/she entered my Response as "Misc/Letter" consistent with the argument from Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Chambers. With all due respect, I do believe that this has to do with the "*Malarkey*" I wrote about earlier and the fact that a judge of the judiciary should not be making a ruling on a Response to a Court's Order based on a fax that counsel to one of the parties sent to him/her. So classifying my "Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017" as a "Misc/Letter", I guess, would provide cover for that.

It is also ironic that as per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of February 1, 2017, "*We note that a document resembling in respects the attachment to the letter* [my "Motion to Deny Defendants' Attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Request for Local Rule 37.2 Conference"] *was filed on the ECF system on January 31, 2017 (Docket# 64). The Court has considered all these materials and denies plaintiff's request that the Court not hold a conference at all*" yet, the said judge finds it proper to hold a conference where the counsel for the Defendants in his Letter Motion stated that "*she* [Plaintiff, Candice Lue] *should be compelled to execute the requested releases and provide documents relating to those earnings and efforts, regardless of date, since January 7, 2016*" when there is **nothing** pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and/or 42 U.S.C. § 1981 ("Section 1981") that makes the demand for these releases/authorizations relevant and/or constitutional.

This is also the said judge who pretty much made up excuses about "*defective service of process*" (docket entry # 17) for the favored, multi-billion dollar Defendants to avoid rendering the Judgment of Default I had filed against them for not filing an Answer within the 21 days that the law allows to do so. Bearing in mind that Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein did not even have the authority to be handling dispositive matters for this case and for **37 days** JPMorgan Chase & Co.'s two well seasoned attorneys with up to 60 years of legal experience between them did not raise the issue of "*defective service of process*" on their own because, as per the evidence presented, the

service was made pursuant to one of the said attorney's specification. Yet, Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein is warning of sanctions against me which includes dismissing my case (a dispositive act) for not attending a façade masquerading as a "Conference".

Per the Friday, February 10, 2017 Minute Entry on the Court's docket, "*the Court adjourns the conference sine die*". So, why is there an "adjourned discovery conference" for March 6, 2017? Will this "adjourned discovery conference" be used to grant the requests of the Defendants' attorney's Letter Motion of January 24, 2017? And why would we still be conducting discovery when the discovery period ended on January 31, 2017 and no further extension was requested of or granted by the Court? What about the summary judgment deadline per Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of December 2, 2016 (docket # 58) which states "*Any summary judgment motion shall be filed by February 22, 2017*"?

This new "adjourned discovery conference" for March 6, 2017 is a continued façade to conceal information from the public's immediate view because based on the favors demanded (favors because there is nothing in the Constitution that gives the right to the judge to compel me to comply with executing releases/authorizations that are unconstitutional) in the Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Letter Motion of January 24, 2017 (docket entry # 62), all Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein needs to do is to have Mr. Kaplan follow proper Court procedure and/or his Individual Practice by requesting an extension of discovery from the Court and file a motion to compel me to do all the things he, Mr. Kaplan, is asking the judge in his Letter Motion to compel me to do. Why do I have to waste a day's wages so that the Defendants' attorney does not have to put his request for an extension of discovery and his "Motion to Compel" in the public's immediate view aka on the Court's docket for the judge to grant him his requests? This said Conference now re-scheduled for March 6, 2017 is eerily similar to what transpired per the Court's docket entries 38, 39 and 41.

Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's relationship with the Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan is the antithesis of the precedence that states: "*In order to preserve the integrity of the judiciary, and*

to ensure that justice is carried out in each individual case, judges must adhere to high standards of conduct." - York v. United States, 785 A.2d 651, 655 (D.C. 2001).

Based on the arguments set forth in this document, it is obvious that the Court is providing immunity to JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al against this legal action I have brought against them. That is why when I raised the issue of employment racial discrimination against me to JPMorgan Chase & Co.'s managers and its HR department, my complaint was either ignored, aided, abetted, enforced, shooed away and/or dismissed because the Court would be there to protect the powerful, multi-billion dollar Defendants, JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al which is not only unfair but unconstitutional and degrading to the judiciary.

III. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, I will respectfully say that I did not attend the Local Rule 37.2 Conference motioned by Attorney Anshel Kaplan (docket entry # 62) and granted by Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein (docket entry # 63) on February 10, 2017 as my attendance of this conference would have been the equivalent of me taking myself to the slaughter. And, no one of reasonable mind attends the slaughtering of her own self. As again, this Conference was nothing more than a façade for granting Attorney Anshel Kaplan favors out of the public's immediate view (favors which I do not have access to) and to cause detriment to my lawsuit.

DATED: February 18, 2017

CANDICE LUE

Candice S.M. Lue

Signature

[redacted]

Address

[redacted]

City, State, Zip Code

Subj: **Re: Deficiencies In Plaintiff's Answers to Defendants' Second Set of Interrog...**
Date: 1/21/2017 1:23:52 P.M. Eastern Standard Time
From: CandiceLue[redacted]
To: AKaplan@seyfarth.com
CC: RWhitman@seyfarth.com

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

First off, even with a Motion to Compel filed with the Court and entered on the Court's docket as of October 7, 2016, you have not provided one valid answer and/or an answer with merit/"*substance*" to any of the eighteen (18) "*straightforward questions*", **based on the Defendants' Answer/Affirmative Defenses dated June 30, 2016 and August 1, 2016** respectively, that I had submitted to you in my "First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants" - Thanks to you being SHELTERED by "the courts".

Secondly, my Responses and Objections to the "Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories" stand and so does my Objection to the releases/authorizations that you are requesting and that I have deemed, in my cover letter of January 13, 2017, as being "*either unconstitutional based on the nature of this lawsuit/*[the statutes under which it is filed] *and/or have no potential relevance to Plaintiff's claims or to the Defendants' defenses and as such, are disproportionate to the Defendants' legitimate discovery needs*".

Please also carefully note that subject to and without waiving the aforesaid Objections, I provided you with instructions as to where to retrieve the "*brief description or explanation of attendant allegations*" you are looking for "*in order to more fully understand [my] allegations and prepare [your] defense*". However, based on the meritless and evasive answers and invalid/inapplicable objections you provided for my aforesaid "First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants", I do not have a full understanding of the Defendants' Answer/Affirmative Defenses dated June 30, 2016 and August 1, 2016 respectively which would have been helpful in preparing my arguments.

In any event, subject to and without waiving any of my Objections to the "Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories" and in full accordance with my Response to the said "Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories", I further state the following:

a) INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Please ask your clients, JPMorgan Chase & Co., Alex Khavin and/or Fidelia Shillingford for the names of my "*three predecessors*".

b) INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Please ask your client, Chris Liasis for the name of the White female employee whom he "*allegedly promoted from Analyst to Senior Analyst to Associate to Vice President, all in less than two years*".

c) INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Please note my last paragraph of Paragraph 165 of my Amended Complaint which states, "*This Black JPMorgan Chase employee's story was disturbing but at the time, I was naïve enough to think of it as a "one off" situation without a clue that it was a part of JPMorgan Chase's racist culture against Blacks.*" With that said, I did not ask this Black JPMorgan Chase employee for the name of her manager and at the current moment, I do not recall the department from which she came. However, she came from that department into the Global Commodities - Energy Settlements Department where I was working as a temporary consultant at the time.

On another matter, in the document I gave to you on July 19, 2016 which included "Prospective Witnesses" as one of my Initial Disclosures, as shown below, I described these witnesses but I did not provide their actual names as I have been trying my hardest to maintain the anonymities of the ones not named as "Defendants". However, I will take this opportunity to disclose all of their names under each of the descriptions of the following "Prospective Witnesses" numbered bullets:

PROSPECTIVE WITNESSES:

1. Every current and/or former employee who was a member of the Asset Management Counterparty Risk Group during my employment whether or not that employee is named as a Defendant in this lawsuit:

Alex Khavin (Defendant)
Fidelia Shillingford (Defendant)
Philippe Quix (Defendant)
Thomas Poz (Defendant)
[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Also, as per the request in my letter dated December 3, 2016 - "Response to "Defendants' Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Second Set of Document Requests", I have added [redacted], one of my three predecessors, as a "prospective witness".

2. Every individual named in this lawsuit who was not a member of the Asset Management Counterparty Risk Group during my employment:

John Vega (Defendant – JPMorgan Chase & Co. HR Department)
Helen Dubowy (Defendant – JPMorgan Chase & Co. HR Department)
Chris Liasis (Defendant – Global Commodities - Energy Confirmations Department)
Michelle Sullivan (Defendant – Global Commodities - Energy Confirmations Department)

3. The employee(s) I referenced in paragraph # 27 / # 84 of my Complaint.

[redacted]

In light of the foregoing, please be advised that I do NOT consent to extend the close of discovery to February 28, 2017 as my Responses are complete and have been very timely. Please see comment nos. 1, 2 and 4 of Paragraph 144 of my Amended Complaint and also see Paragraph 145 of my said Amended Complaint as they relate to the timeliness of my work.

Respectfully,

Candice Lue

In a message dated 1/18/2017 8:19:05 P.M. Eastern Standard Time, AKaplan@seyfarth.com writes:

> Dear Ms. Lue:
>
> We are in receipt of your Answers to Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories") and write to raise two issues with you, as well as request your consent for a 30-day extension of the January 31 discovery deadline.
>
> First, the Interrogatories consist of eight straightforward questions seeking the identity of certain individuals referenced in the complaint, and in some instances a brief description or explanation of attendant allegations. We are entitled to this information in order to more fully understand your allegations and prepare our defense. However, your answers fail to disclose the requested names of any of these individuals (with the sole exception of the name referenced in Paragraph 84), and they mention multiple episodes to which you could be referring as the allegedly "same treatment."
>
> While you have asserted objections in these responses, the objections are not valid because they state that "all potential witnesses . . . supporting [*your*] claim . . . have already been disclosed in the initial disclosures" (emphasis added), and that "Defendants are seeking trial preparation material." These objections do not excuse your failure to respond to the eight simple questions we have asked regarding the substance of certain allegations in your Complaint.

[redacted]

Subj: **Lue v JPMorgan Chase & Co. et al - Three Issues for Your Immediate Attention**
Date: 1/28/2017 1:55:28 P.M. Eastern Standard Time
From: CandiceLue[redacted]
To: akaplan@seyfarth.com
CC: rwhitman@seyfarth.com

Mr. Kaplan:

I respectfully ask that you give the following three issues your immediate attention.

Issue # 1:
I am in receipt of a copy of the "Letter Motion" dated January 24, 2017 that you sent to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein which was never sent to me via email (with emphasis) as you stated at the end of the said letter.

This was also the case with your letter to the said judge dated November 25, 2016 which contrary to me receiving this letter in my inbox immediately via email, this said letter was postmarked November 28, 2016 (three days after you stated that it was sent to me via email) and I received it via USPS first class mail on/or around November 30, 2016, five days after it was sent to me.

I think this practice of yours whereby you claim that you send me copies of these letters, etc. via email is misleading to the Court and to whomever you send a copy of these letters, etc. and I respectfully ask that you stop it. As, as you are well aware, push comes to shove, I will be asking that you "prove it".

With that being said, please be advised that my preferred mode for letters, motions, etc. being sent to me is via USPS first class mail, FedEx, etc. and **not** via email.

Issue #2:
By way of the pre-filled authorizations/releases that you had sent to me, I became aware of the fact that you are in possession of my social security number. Please be advised that I did not give this information to you and I do not expect you to be using my social security number in any way without my permission.

Issue #3:
Finally, I'd respectfully ask that you redact the last portion of my email address when you send copies of my email correspondence with you to third parties (like how you see me redact this information).

Respectfully,

Candice Lue

[redacted]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK

CANDICE LUE, an individual,

Plaintiff

V.

JPMORGAN CHASE & CO. a Delaware Corporation; ALEX KHAVIN, an individual; FIDELIA SHILLINGFORD, an individual; JOHN VEGA, an individual; HELEN DUBOWY, an individual; PHILIPPE QUIX, an individual; THOMAS POZ, an individual; CHRIS LIASIS, an individual; MICHELLE SULLIVAN, an individual; and DOES 1 - 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Civil Action No.: 16 CV 3207 (AJN) (GWG)

Motion to Deny Defendants' Attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Request for Local Rule 37.2 Conference
- Anyone of reasonable mind will see that substantive responses were provided to the "Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories" dated December 15, 2016 as well as valid responses were provided to other requests. The Defendants' attorney is seeking favors from the court (which I do not have access to) in order to be successful in this lawsuit.

I. ARGUMENT

I, pro se Plaintiff, Candice Lue, having acknowledged entry # 62 on the Court's docket via www.pacermonitor.com (see attached) and having received the attached email dated January 23, 2017 from the Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan, hereby respectfully move this court to deny the said attorney's request for Local Rule 37.2 Conference, as anyone of reasonable mind will see that substantive responses were provided to the "Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories" dated December 15, 2016 as well as valid responses were provided to other requests.

Further, it is very ironic that this said attorney who did not provide one valid answer and/or an answer with merit or substance to any of the eighteen (18) Interrogatories in my "First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants" that I had submitted to him and which were based solely on the Defendants' Answer/Affirmative Defenses dated June 30, 2016 and August 1, 2016 respectively, to my Complaint/Amended Complaint, is now seeking the Court's intervention in compelling me to

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK

CANDICE LUE, an individual,

Plaintiff

V.

JPMORGAN CHASE & CO. a Delaware Corporation; ALEX KHAVIN, an individual; FIDELIA SHILLINGFORD, an individual; JOHN VEGA, an individual; HELEN DUBOWY, an individual; PHILIPPE QUIX, an individual; THOMAS POZ, an individual; CHRIS LIASIS, an individual; MICHELLE SULLIVAN, an individual; and DOES 1 - 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Civil Action No.: 16 CV 3207 (AJN) (GWG)

Response to Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein's Order of January 27, 2017
- The short notice for the Conference is utterly inconvenient and financially burdensome. Further, contrary to Docket entry #s 62 and 63, there is nothing in Defendants' Attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Letter Motion requesting a Rule 37.2 Conference. The Defendants' attorney is seeking an extension of Discovery to 2/28/2017 (even though the Court had just granted him a 60 day extension to 1/31/2017), for the Court to compel me to sign releases and authorizations which are unconstitutional and to compel me to provide answers to "Defendants Second Set of Interrogatories" which I had already provided. The said attorney has not provided one substantive answer to any of my eighteen (18) "First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants"

I. ARGUMENT

I, pro se Plaintiff, Candice Lue, find both Docket entry #s 62 and 63 on the Court's docket to be publicly misleading as there is nothing in Defendants' attorney, Anshel Kaplan's Letter Motion requesting Local Rule 37.2 Conference. The attorney is merely seeking another favor from the court (which I do not have access to) and is trying to conceal such favor from public view considering the fact that the Court/ Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein had just granted the said attorney a 60 day extension to January 31, 2017. With that said, besides the fact that the short notice for the Conference that Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein has ordered is utterly inconvenient and financially burdensome for me to attend, I do consider this Conference to be a façade for granting Attorney, Anshel Kaplan favors out of the public's view.