



*State of New York*  
*Court of Appeals*

Vol. 45 - No.17  
5/5/25

*Heather Davis, Esq.*  
*Chief Clerk and*  
*Legal Counsel to the Court*

*Clerk's Office*  
*20 Eagle Street*  
*Albany, New York 12207-1095*  
*518-455-7700*

COURT OF APPEALS NEW FILINGS

Preliminary Appeal Statements processed  
by the Court of Appeals Clerk's Office

**April 25, 2025 through May 1, 2025**

Each week the Clerk's Office prepares a list of recently-filed appeals, indicating short title, jurisdictional predicate, subject matter and key issues. Some of these appeals may not reach decision on the merits because of dismissal, on motion or sua sponte, or because the parties stipulate to withdrawal. Some appeals may be selected for review pursuant to the alternative procedure of Rule 500.11. For those appeals that proceed to briefing in the normal course, the briefing schedule generally will be: appellant's brief to be filed within 60 days after the appeal was taken; respondent's brief to be filed within 45 days after the due date for the filing of appellant's brief; and a reply brief, if any, to be filed within 15 days after the due date for the filing of respondent's brief.

**The Court welcomes motions for amicus curiae participation from those qualified and interested in the subject matter of these newly filed appeals. Please refer to Rule 500.23 and direct any questions to the Clerk's Office.**

CV XXVIII v WILLIAMS:

APL-2025-00078

2nd Dept. App. Div. order of 3/12/25; affirmance; sua sponte examination of whether the order appealed from finally determines the action within the meaning of the Constitution and whether a substantial constitutional question is directly involved in the order appealed from;

**Limitation of Actions—Commencement of Action after Termination of Prior Action—Whether the mortgage foreclosure action was properly dismissed as time-barred under the Foreclosure Abuse Prevention Act (FAPA); whether certain provisions of FAPA, and the application of FAPA in this case, are unconstitutional;**

Supreme Court, Kings County, among other things, in effect, granted the branch of the motion of defendant Mark Williams which was, in effect, for summary judgment dismissing the complaint insofar as asserted against him as time-barred; App. Div. affirmed.