

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF NEW YORK

ARAS,

Appellant,

-against-

NO. 10

B-U REALTY CORP,

Respondent.

20 Eagle Street
Albany, New York
January 7, 2026

Before:

CHIEF JUDGE ROWAN D. WILSON
ASSOCIATE JUDGE JENNY RIVERA
ASSOCIATE JUDGE MICHAEL J. GARCIA
ASSOCIATE JUDGE MADELINE SINGAS
ASSOCIATE JUDGE ANTHONY CANNATARO
ASSOCIATE JUDGE SHIRLEY TROUTMAN
ASSOCIATE JUDGE CAITLIN J. HALLIGAN

Appearances:

DAMON P. HOWARD, ESQ.
EPHRON-MANDEL & HOWARD, LLP
Attorney for Appellant
299 Broadway, 17th Floor
Suite 1615
New York, NY 10007

MICHAEL LITTMAN, ESQ.
SIDRANE, SCHWARTZ-SIDRANE, PERINBASEKAR & LITTMAN, LLP
Attorney for Respondent
119 North Park Avenue
Suite 201
Rockville Centre, NY 11570

Brandon Deshawn
Official Court Transcriber

1 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Last case on today's
2 calendar is Aras v. B-U Realty Corporation.

3 MR. HOWARD: Good afternoon. May it please the
4 court. My name is Damon Howard, of Ephron-Mandel & Howard,
5 for the appellants-plaintiffs in this case. I'd like to
6 respectfully request two minutes of my time be set aside
7 for rebuttal.

8 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Of course.

9 MR. HOWARD: The case that is before the court
10 today arises from the obligation of a landlord, under New
11 York law, to afford a landlord that is a recipient of J-51
12 tax benefits, the rights and protections of rent
13 stabilization. In this case, there is no question. On the
14 record below, it is conceded by the - - - by the defendants
15 on the record below that the plaintiffs here were not
16 afforded those protections. The trial court awarded
17 summary judgment on the core issue, which is before this
18 court, finding that there was a fraudulent scheme to
19 deregulate. The Appellate Division then reversed this
20 finding and in a very highly - - -

21 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: That finding has to be made
22 apartment by apartment?

23 MR. HOWARD: I'm sorry?

24 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: That finding has to be made
25 apartment by apartment, or it can be made for the whole

1 building?

2 MR. HOWARD: Well, Your Honor, this does not
3 arise in a vacuum. There are twenty-two other - - - there
4 are twenty-two total tenants and nine lawsuits. This is
5 the fifth case in which a trial court awarded summary
6 judgment, finding that there had been a fraudulent scheme
7 of deregulation.

8 JUDGE GARCIA: I think, though, what the Chief
9 Judge may be asking is, is there one finding of fraud that
10 would apply to all of the apartments, or are the facts and
11 circumstances different for each?

12 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, there has been, by the
13 First Department, a finding in Kreisler that there was a
14 fraudulent scheme of deregulation that touched on the
15 entire building. It was based on evidence regarding the
16 histories of the entire building. However, there are
17 particulars of each of the plaintiffs in this case that are
18 relevant before the court today. They're broadly in two
19 categories. For our purposes, there are those
20 approximately one half of the plaintiffs whose apartments
21 were deregulated after Roberts. And then there are those
22 cases - - - those plaintiffs whose apartments were never
23 brought under rent stabilization in 2005 when the J-51 tax
24 benefits began in the first place. And we think that those
25 actually make this a very unusual case within that - - -

1 JUDGE GARCIA: Other than those two buckets, one
2 of them - - - are there specific circumstances as to the
3 landlord's actions with respect to each of the units that
4 would affect the fraud finding?

5 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor. And in the - - -
6 in the latter category of the - - - the tenants whose
7 apartments were deregulated after Roberts, the - - - the
8 core fact there is, in Roberts, this court made a very
9 clear holding. They said if you're receiving J-51 tax
10 benefits, you have one real obligation under the law,
11 that's to give those tenants the rights and protections of
12 rent stabilization. And the fact that that - - - that
13 lease difference was made clear - - -

14 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Roberts didn't - - - Roberts
15 didn't indicate - - - sorry. Roberts didn't indicate
16 whether that - - - its ruling operated retroactively or
17 prospectively only, right?

18 MR. HOWARD: That's correct, Your Honor.
19 Gersten, in 2011 - - - in August of 2011, and this timing
20 is important, the Court of Appeals says not for the first
21 time - - -

22 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: First Department.

23 MR. HOWARD: Sorry.

24 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: First Department, not the
25 Court of Appeals, Gersten.

1 MR. HOWARD: Oh, sorry. Yes. In August of 2011,
2 the First Department says for the first time that if you
3 landlords that have deregulated apartments during J-51 are
4 unclear, we're making it clear you must reregulate all of
5 those units. It was never in question, even in 2011, that
6 you can no longer deregulate an apartment while receiving
7 J-51 tax benefits. That was clear as of Roberts. That's
8 why this distinction on the timing is very important. The
9 fact is that they are deregulating apartments years after
10 Roberts. And that is enough, but I would also note that a
11 number of those post-Roberts deregulations occurs after
12 Gersten as well. We think that that's not relevant because
13 all that decided was the obligation to restore apartments
14 that had been deregulated during the J-51 to rent
15 stabilization. That's none of these apartments. They were
16 - - -

17 JUDGE CANNATARO: So it sounds like you're saying
18 there are sufficient individualized considerations that
19 there is no broad application of a fraud finding that would
20 be applicable here.

21 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, we would respectfully
22 submit that there are both. Each of these individual cases
23 has, on its own merits, sufficient evidence to support a
24 finding of fraud within the meaning of the Regina and
25 Burrows precedent. Now, that has been clarified by the

1 chapter amendments, a colorable claim, or indicia of fraud.
2 However - - -

3 JUDGE GARCIA: So to go to that point, just for a
4 minute, this opinion came down before Burrows, right?

5 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE GARCIA: And I think it's your position
7 that they applied the wrong standard, basically, based on
8 footnote 7, I think it is, from Regina?

9 MR. HOWARD: That's correct, Your Honor. In
10 Burrows in 2025, this court specifically citing to this
11 case, as well as a companion case from the Second
12 Department, specifically says that there is a
13 misinterpretation, essentially, of footnote 7 of this
14 court's decision in Regina, which had to set forth the
15 common law factors of fraud.

16 JUDGE GARCIA: And if we were to agree with that,
17 what would we do here?

18 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, I would like to place
19 this case within the context - - - there's been many cases
20 arising out of this particular body of law, but the - - -
21 there's a core spine of cases, and I would sort of like
22 this to sort of explain where I think that this case should
23 bookend that line of cases.

24 JUDGE CANNATARO: I would really like to hear the
25 answer to Judge Garcia's question.

1 JUDGE GARCIA: We believe they applied the wrong
2 standard based on footnote 7 of Regina. What should we do
3 here?

4 MR. HOWARD: The - - - we would ask that this
5 court specifically say that the doctrine of safe harbor
6 recognized for landlords that deregulated apartments during
7 a J-51 not be extended to instances such as in this case,
8 where those apartments were not deregulated during a J-51.
9 So the central inference of good faith that was at the core
10 of Regina was essentially like - - - DHCR said - - -

11 JUDGE RIVERA: The - - -

12 MR. HOWARD: - - - this is okay.

13 JUDGE RIVERA: Do we have to send it - - -

14 MR. HOWARD: You can do - - -

15 JUDGE RIVERA: - - - back so that they apply the
16 correct standard given Burrows?

17 MR. HOWARD: I'm sorry?

18 JUDGE RIVERA: Do we have to send it back so that
19 they can apply the correct standard given Burrows?

20 MR. HOWARD: No, Your Honor. I would submit that
21 - - -

22 JUDGE RIVERA: Okay.

23 MR. HOWARD: - - - just as the First Department
24 did in Kreisler and three other trial courts have found
25 summary judgment based on the evidence before the court,

1 that it is appropriate here, I would point to a couple of
2 things.

3 JUDGE CANNATARO: But they misapplied footnote 7
4 from Regina. They - - - I mean, that seems relatively
5 clear from the text. And now we have Burrows. And it
6 provides a much clearer instruction of what you're supposed
7 to do with footnote 7 or what the import of it is. Why
8 shouldn't we give them an opportunity to look at that?

9 JUDGE GARCIA: Especially since you said there
10 are certain nuances as to the facts and circumstances with
11 respect to each apartment.

12 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, those nuances arise from
13 the undisputed records - - - the undisputed record of fact
14 below. There is no issue of fact here. The fact of the
15 matter is that - - -

16 JUDGE GARCIA: But isn't that the question, under
17 the appropriate standard, is there an issue of fact?

18 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, I would submit that the
19 core issue of when did they deregulate or fail to bring
20 apartments under rent stabilization in the first place,
21 that's not disputed. It's the - - - the defendants does
22 not - - -

23 JUDGE RIVERA: In the fraud question - - - but if
24 it's the wrong standard on the fraud, why not send it back?
25 Let them, in the first instance, apply the correct

1 standard.

2 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, I would submit that the
3 original trial court, who ruled before courts began basing
4 decisions on footnote 7 in Regina, had, in fact, in most
5 cases, applied the correct standard and awarded summary
6 judgment to the majority of the plaintiffs based on the
7 fact that there is no real issue of fact regarding intent.
8 The fact of the matter is, you have a sophisticated
9 landlord with extensive real estate holdings in New York
10 City, who acknowledges in testimony that he knew from the
11 Rent Stabilization Association publications as early as
12 2009, that he was aware of Roberts and its implications and
13 the import that it had, but nonetheless, failed to act.

14 He failed to bring those apartments under rent
15 regulation until 2014 when the DHCR reaches out and says,
16 you're not appropriately regulating apartments. Even then,
17 it took the better part of a year. As late as 2015, he's
18 still bringing apartments under rent stabilization.
19 Roberts was handed down in 2009.

20 The only credible - - - the only explanation
21 that's offered, which has no credibility, is that mistakes
22 were made. It said in the passive voice, no responsibility
23 taken despite the sophistication of the landlord, mistakes
24 were made. It does not say why he believes that the DHCR's
25 policy, which had to do with deregulation during a J-51,

1 had any relationship to the failure to bring apartments
2 under rent stabilization in the first place in 2005, or his
3 failure to - - - or rather, his affirmative deregulation of
4 apartments many years after the Court of Appeals in Roberts
5 said that that was illegal.

6 So the - - - on those issues of whether or not
7 there's an explanation that could support the inference of
8 good faith that is core to this decision - - - the court's
9 decision in Regina, that no such inference of good faith
10 can be made here because the fact of the matter is, there
11 was only one obligation that he had. He's a sophisticated
12 landlord, extensive real estate holdings, and he doesn't
13 comply with that one thing, even though he admits on the
14 record below, and there's numerous decisions on summary
15 judgment, one upheld on by the First Department in Kreisler
16 in 2018 that said that he specifically acted with willful
17 disregard of the fact that he knew as early as 2009 of his
18 obligations following Roberts. And - - -

19 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Well, what he would have
20 known in 2009 is that he would have to register apartments
21 in the future, but it's not until Gersten that he maybe
22 thinks that he - - - Gersten or whatever it's called - - -
23 that he may have to register them going back; is that
24 right?

25 MR. HOWARD: That's correct. But none of - - -



1 none of these apartments fit that category.

2 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Well, let me ask you about,
3 just as an example, 10B, which is occupied - - - was
4 occupied by Gladstone and Campana - - - I may have the
5 facts wrong, but let me state them as I think I understand
6 them.

7 MR. HOWARD: Sure.

8 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: They moved in in 2003, so
9 that's before the J-51 entirely, right?

10 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor.

11 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: So apartment is not
12 registered. And they paid rent in 2003 and 2004, and the
13 rent they paid then was the correct rent. Same for the
14 first of 2 - - - first part of 2005, there's still no J-51
15 in place; is that fair?

16 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor. I think that's a
17 good - - -

18 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Okay.

19 MR. HOWARD: That's a good case to pause on.

20 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Okay. So let me - - - well,
21 I'm not pausing.

22 MR. HOWARD: Sorry.

23 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: I'm going to continue to go.
24 So that would mean, I think, that under Regina and Casey
25 until 2012, there can't have been any fraud and failing to

1 register the apartment as stabilized because Roberts
2 doesn't tell them they've got to go back and register it.
3 It's not until - - - no? Okay. Tell me what's wrong.

4 MR. HOWARD: The - - - the difference is, Roberts
5 is about deregulating apartments that you've already
6 regulated after you receive a J-51. So what should have
7 happened is, it was okay, maybe. We don't know. Maybe
8 deregulated appropriately before 2005 when the J-51 begins.
9 But there's no question - - - and Roberts has nothing to do
10 with the fact that in 2005, he starts receiving those J-51
11 tax benefits. One hundred percent of that building should
12 be rent stabilized. Neither 10B nor over half of the
13 building - - -

14 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Well, then what does - - -
15 but then what does - - - what - - -

16 MR. HOWARD: - - - in 2006 is registered as rent
17 stabilized.

18 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: - - - does Gersten do then?

19 MR. HOWARD: Gersten simply says, hey, landlords,
20 the DHCR said it's okay for you to deregulate apartments
21 during a J-51 if you - - - if it's - - - it's the only
22 reason that it is rent stabilized. If you did that
23 inadvertently based on incorrect DHCR guidance, bring it
24 under rent stabilization. You have to go back and
25 reregulate it. It's retroactive. That's not any of these

1 apartments. None of these apartments were deregulated
2 during the J-51 prior to Roberts. It was either they never
3 brought them under rent stabilization in the first place in
4 2005 when the law was very clear. There was no question.
5 And in fact, they - - - they admit, essentially, by saying
6 that they were relying on the DHCR guidance. It means that
7 they knew what the DHCR - - -

8 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: But why are you saying the
9 law was clear in 2000 - - -

10 MR. HOWARD: - - - DHCR's guidance was, which
11 meant that - - - it included rent stabilization.

12 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Why - - - why are you saying
13 the law was clear in 2005?

14 MR. HOWARD: Sorry, Your Honor?

15 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Why are you saying the law
16 was very clear that they had to regulate them in 2005?

17 MR. HOWARD: Because that was the only thing that
18 they had to do. They could have said - - - so for example,
19 10B, they could have brought it under rent stabilization in
20 2005, and thereafter, five years later - - -

21 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: I thought that was the - - -

22 MR. HOWARD: - - - to - - - to the threshold and
23 deregulated.

24 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: I thought that was the
25 import of the Roberts decision.

1 MR. HOWARD: The import of the Roberts decision
2 was that the DHCR's guidance, which had said it's okay,
3 where the only reason a building is rent stabilized - - -
4 you can - - - because of the J-51 tax benefits, you can
5 deregulate those apartments. So Roberts says, we - - - the
6 - - - the DHCR was incorrect in the interpretation of its
7 own laws.

8 JUDGE CANNATARO: Right. And that was 2009,
9 right?

10 MR. HOWARD: Yes.

11 JUDGE CANNATARO: So prior to 2009, DHCR guidance
12 would be a justification - - -

13 MR. HOWARD: Yes.

14 JUDGE CANNATARO: - - - for deregulating.

15 MR. HOWARD: If - - - so if, for example - - -
16 using 10B, again, as an example, in 2005, the J-51 tax
17 benefits begin. 10B had already been deregulated. It
18 wasn't rent stabilized, so it should have been treated as
19 rent stabilized thereafter before 2009. In good faith, the
20 landlord could have deregulated. The DHCR guidance allowed
21 for that. But that's not what happened.

22 JUDGE CANNATARO: Oh, I see. So you're saying
23 it's not the fact that the landlord might have deregulated
24 it. It's the fact that the landlord never regulated it in
25 the first place.

1 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor.

2 JUDGE CANNATARO: Okay. At least I understand
3 the argument now.

4 MR. HOWARD: Yes.

5 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Thank you.

6 MR. LITTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honors. May
7 it please the court. My name is Michael Littman, from the
8 law office of Sidrane, Schwartz-Sidrane, Perinbasekar &
9 Littman, for the respondents, the landlords. I think the
10 first question that this court asked is the most important,
11 which is that each of these apartments needs to be viewed
12 on their own. Each of the apartments have their own rent
13 history. Each of the apartments have their own different
14 regulatory scheme. Some of the apartments were rent
15 controlled previous to the acceptance of the J-51. Some of
16 them were rent stabilized. Some of them were deregulated
17 years prior. Some of the tenants moved in prior to the
18 acceptance of the J-51 in July of - - -

19 JUDGE RIVERA: So what's the upshot of that?

20 MR. LITTMAN: That the burden on the plaintiffs
21 is that they're trying to establish that there was a scheme
22 to fraudulently deregulate all of the apartments.

23 JUDGE RIVERA: But doesn't - - - don't we have to
24 send it back since there was a misunderstanding of the
25 standard?

1 MR. LITTMAN: No, Your Honor. I think at the
2 time the court was correct as to the standard. The
3 Appellate Division used this court's decision in Regina,
4 which - - -

5 JUDGE HALLIGAN: Yeah. But that's been clarified
6 in Burrows, right?

7 MR. LITTMAN: Correct.

8 JUDGE HALLIGAN: So why wouldn't we send it back
9 in light of that clarification?

10 MR. LITTMAN: I think even if the court had used
11 the clarification in Burrows, that the court would come out
12 with the same result. If they looked at the totality of
13 the circumstances - - -

14 JUDGE RIVERA: But why wouldn't we send it back
15 to let them do that work in the first instance?

16 MR. LITTMAN: I think this court, respectfully,
17 can do that same analysis.

18 JUDGE GARCIA: Given what you just said, that
19 each one of these apartments has specific nuances and
20 different circumstances and different histories, this court
21 should look at all of these apartments and do that in the
22 first instance?

23 MR. LITTMAN: Well, I think that the lower
24 court's already used the totality of the circumstances in
25 determining whether or not there was fraud. They came to a

1 conclusion that there was no fraud.

2 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Well, but the question is
3 what standard of fraud they used, right?

4 MR. LITTMAN: Yes.

5 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: And it seems that they used
6 the common law standard, no?

7 MR. LITTMAN: It seems that way.

8 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Yeah. And we've said in
9 Burrows that's not the right standard?

10 MR. LITTMAN: Correct.

11 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Okay.

12 MR. LITTMAN: I think even if the court were to -
13 - -

14 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: So I'm not sure why the
15 totality of the circumstances matter and if they're using
16 the wrong legal standard.

17 MR. LITTMAN: Well, the plaintiffs still need to
18 establish that there was an intent on the part of the
19 defendants to deceive or defraud - - -

20 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Sure.

21 MR. LITTMAN: - - - the defendants.

22 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Sure.

23 MR. LITTMAN: And I think that even if the lower
24 court had used the new standard that was in Burrows, they
25 would have come to the same conclusion.

1 JUDGE HALLIGAN: The question is just why not put
2 that to the test and allow the lower court to make that
3 determination?

4 MR. LITTMAN: I don't think it's necessary, Your
5 Honor, at this - - - at this stage of the case that is now
6 eleven years old. At the time, that was not the standard.
7 Up until 2020, when Regina issued, there was no method to
8 calculate in this circumstance what - - - what the rents
9 were.

10 JUDGE CANNATARO: Counsel, can I posit a reason
11 why it might be necessary? And you can tell me why it's
12 wrong. The finding itself is essentially a factual
13 determination, which we don't do. But we did look at the
14 standard that the Appellate Division was applying to its
15 factual determination. And there's a possibility that the
16 - - - four or more judges on this court think that they
17 applied the wrong standard based on what we subsequently
18 articulated in Burrows. So isn't that in itself a good
19 reason to send it back for application of the correct
20 standard?

21 MR. LITTMAN: Well, the standard at the time
22 before the chapter amendments was what the lower court
23 used.

24 JUDGE CANNATARO: Okay. But then it went to the
25 Appellate Division, and they used something different.

1 MR. LITTMAN: Well, they - - -

2 JUDGE CANNATARO: They basically said that post-
3 Regina, nothing but common law fraud - - - or, you know,
4 because of footnote 7, nothing other than common law fraud
5 is going to get you a summary judgment.

6 MR. LITTMAN: That is correct.

7 JUDGE CANNATARO: That's what we said is not
8 correct. We just require some indicia of fraud.

9 MR. LITTMAN: Right. Which I think the
10 plaintiffs have failed to do. There was no finding of that
11 below. The chapter amendments, like I previously said,
12 came after the lower court's decision and after the
13 Appellate Division's decision. The burden was on the
14 tenants to prove that the landlord knowingly engaged in a
15 fraudulent scheme to deregulate under the totality of the
16 circumstances. I don't think that standard - - -

17 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: But don't we actually, in
18 Burrows, have a footnote at the very end that disclaims our
19 reliance in Burrows on the chapter amendment you're
20 referring to?

21 MR. LITTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

22 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: So I'm not sure why you're
23 bringing up the chapter amendment.

24 MR. LITTMAN: Only to say that it came after - -
25 -

1 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Yeah. But it also was
2 irrelevant to our decision in Burrows, which said, this is
3 what we meant in Regina all along.

4 MR. LITTMAN: Correct, Your Honor. If there's no
5 other questions, thank you.

6 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Thank you.

7 MR. HOWARD: I would like to speak specifically
8 to what this court - - - what would be appropriate under
9 the circumstances, and whether it should be remanded to the
10 lower court for a finding based on the correct fraud. And
11 again, as the court has noted, the - - - what has been made
12 clear is that the same standard of fraud applies as has
13 been applied for nearly twenty years in Grimm, Thornton,
14 and Conason, which were cited by Regina and which the
15 chapter amendment simply said, we're trying to restore the
16 case law to the point from which it diverged. And that was
17 footnote 17 in Regina, which was misinterpreted.

18 So I would submit that the original trial court,
19 using that standard, actually applied it correctly in
20 finding, generally, that there was a scheme of fraud. That
21 finding applied both to all of the tenants here based on
22 commonalities of fact, but also on specifics of those
23 individual cases. But those specific - - - those instances
24 that are specific to their cases, the only demarcation
25 between those - - - these eight households is whether or

1 not they were deregulated after Roberts, and in some cases,
2 after Gersten, or if they were never regulated in the first
3 place. There's no question - - - there's no issue on the
4 record of - - - on the record below regarding any of those
5 essential facts that are necessary for a finding of fraud
6 based on the standard that is properly applied by this
7 court, as noted in Burrows. I would also note that, if
8 this court were to remand, what is it remanding for? This
9 was a motion for summary judgment the - - -

10 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Well, the dissent in the
11 Appellate Division said that this should go to trial - - -
12 these should go to trial, right?

13 MR. HOWARD: Respectfully, at that point, Burrows
14 had not been handed down, and the court was unclear about
15 the standard. You know, we agree with some of the points
16 that were made regarding the standard being used by the
17 dissent, but we disagree with the outcome. We think that
18 the lower court's decision regarding fraud should be
19 upheld. The star witness in this case, the person whose
20 statements were central to whether or not they acknowledge
21 or not, he - - - he is deceased during the pendency of this
22 - - - this appeal - - - the star witness has passed. And
23 so the parties would either be making another motion for
24 summary judgment or they'd be having a trial without the
25 person whose knowledge is relevant being able to testify in

1 what regard he took these actions that are at issue before
2 the court.

3 So I would respectfully submit that the
4 appropriate outcome here is for there to be a finding of a
5 fraudulent scheme of deregulation with respect to each of
6 these individuals and with respect to the building
7 generally, and that the default formula should be applied.

8 CHIEF JUDGE WILSON: Thank you.

9 (Court is adjourned)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Brandon Deshawn, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Court of Appeals of Aras v. B-U Realty Corp, No. 10 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Brandon Deshawn

Signature: _____

Agency Name: eScribers

Address of Agency: 7227 North 16th Street
Suite 207
Phoenix, AZ 85020

Date: January 17, 2026

