SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: HON. CAROL SHARPE **PART** 52M
Justice

----------X

JOMO M WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

- v -

DONALD TRUMP, NAYIB BUKELE, ERIC ADAMS, NYC DOC, NYC BOE, NYC CFB, NYC COIB, NYC DOITT, LINKNYC, NYC OTI, JOHN DOES,

Defendant.

----------X

INDEX NO. 155472/2025

MOTION DATE 09/23/2025, 06/17/2025

MOTION SEQ. NO. 003 004

DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 003) 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 139

were read on this motion to/for ENFORCEMENT.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 46, 118, 125, 126, 127, 134, 138

were read on this motion to/for ELECTION LAW - VALIDATE PETITION.

On October 14, 2025, petitioner filed an Order to Show Cause ("OSC"), Mtn. Seq. #3, (NYSCEF Doc. #116), seeking leave to renew and reargue the Court's prior Decision and Order dated September 3, 2025 (NYSCEF Doc. #47), in which his prior OSC, Mtn. Seq. #1, was denied on the grounds that he failed to properly serve the defendants, that this Court does not have jurisdiction over President Donald Trump and President Nayib Bukele, and that there were not any cognizable claims in the complaint. In Mtn. Seq. #3, which was signed on October 14, 2025, and made returnable on October 22, 2025, petitioner seeks, among many other reliefs, a declaration that President Trump's threats to deploy federal troops is a violation of the election law and the New York State constitution, and for an injunction prohibiting the deployment of such troops and other agents into New York State.

On October 14, 2025, petitioner filed another OSC, Mtn. Seq. #4 (NYSCEF Doc. #118), seeking that the court to deem certain filings (specifically NYSCEF Doc. #60, #67, and #71) as properly filed and made part of the motion to reargue, and for an expedited judicial review. In his reply to Mtn. Seq. #3 and Mtn. Seq. #4, petitioner asked for a traverse hearing on the issue of service of the original petition. Mtn. Seq. #4 was signed on October 16, 2025, and made returnable on October 22, 2025. Corporation Counsel filed written opposition on the grounds that the motion was brought after the 30-day limit allowed to file a motion to reargue, and that defendant Eric Adams, as Mayor of New York City, and defendant New York City Campaign Finance Board, are not agents of President Trump. In his reply papers, petitioner gave the reasonable excuse of having had surgery as the reason for the delay in filing the motion to reargue.

A review of the NYSCEF record showed that petitioner filed five other OSCs, also under Mtn. Seq. #3 (NYSCEF Doc. #78, #85, #88, #92, and #101), but these documents were never presented to this Court. In those OSCs, petitioner added new defendants, including his political rivals who were seeking the same Council seat in the 7th Municipal District, Eric Adams, the NYPD, MTA, and EZ Pass, among others, and submitted new facts and supporting exhibits.

At the oral argument on October 22, 2025, for which the defendants failed to appear, petitioner addressed the issues in the two signed OSCs, as well as the issues in the unsigned OSCs, including issues with the NYC Department of Finance, his political rivals, and the alleged vandalism to his vehicle. The motion to renew and reargue is denied in its entirety.

A motion to renew "shall be based upon new facts not offered on the prior motion that would change the prior determination or shall demonstrate that there has been a change in the law that would change the prior determination; and" [CPLR 2221(e)(2)], "shall contain reasonable justification for the failure to present such facts on the prior motion" [CPLR 2221(e)(3)]. A

"[r]enewal is granted sparingly…it is not a second chance freely given to parties who have not exercised due diligence in making their first factual presentation" (*Beiny v Wynyard (In re Beiny)*, 132 AD2d 190, 210, 522 NYS2d 511 [1st Dept 1987]; *Acevedo v Nurmamatov*, 206 AD3d 488, 168 NYS3d 317 [1st Dept 2022]). A motion for leave to reargue "shall be based upon matters of fact or law allegedly overlooked or misapprehended by the court in determining the prior motion, but shall not include any matters of fact not offered on the prior motion" (CPLR 2221 [d] [2]).

Petitioner's submissions would not have changed this Court's determination made in the prior decision. (*MB Fin. Bank, N.A. v 56 Walker LLC*, 238 AD3d 605, 232 NYS3d 149 [1st Dept 2025]). This Court did not overlook or misapprehend facts or law in its original decision and there are no new facts or changes in the law, and even if the Court were to accept that a process server served the original OSC and not petitioner, the result is the same. Petitioner was the unopposed candidate for the Council seat on the Republican Party line, so any issues he raised as to the election are moot. Petitioner has failed to state any cognizable claims, and failed to show that this Court has jurisdiction over President Trump and actions he has taken or will take as the President of the United States of America, or jurisdiction over President Nayib Bukele, the President of El Salvador. While a *pro se* complaint should be construed liberally (*Rosen v Raum*, 164 AD2d 809, 811, 559 NYS2d 541 [1st Dept 1990]), petitioner has failed to state a cognizable claim against either of the two presidents.

Furthermore, petitioner has not stated any cognizable claims as he has not established that he has standing to commence an action to prevent President Trump from sending individuals to prison in El Salvador, or to prevent him from deploying the military (*see Matter of Mental Hygiene Legal Serv. v Daniels*, 33 NY3d 44, 50, 98 NYS3d 504 [2019] ["a party challenging governmental action must meet the threshold burden of establishing that it has suffered an "injury in fact" and

that the injury it asserts "fall[s] within the zone of interests or concerns sought to be promoted or protected by the statutory provision under which the [government] has acted" (*New York State Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists v Novello*, 2 NY3d 207, 211, 810 NE2d 405, 778 NYS2d 123 [2004]). The injury-in-fact requirement necessitates a showing that the party has "an actual legal stake in the matter being adjudicated" and has suffered a cognizable harm (*see Society of Plastics*, 77 NY2d at 772) that is not "tenuous," "ephemeral," or "conjectural" but is sufficiently concrete and particularized to warrant judicial intervention (*Novello*, 2 NY3d at 214; *see Spokeo, Inc. v Robins*, 578 US ___, ___, 136 S Ct 1540, 1548, 194 L Ed 2d 635 [2016])").

Here, the Court declines to exercise its discretion to grant renewal or reargument. The Court reviewed all arguments made and exhibits provided by petitioner and found them to be unavailing. It is hereby

ORDERED, that the motion to renew and reargue, Mtn. Seq. #3, is denied; it is further

ORDERED, that the motion for a traverse hearing, Mtn. Seq. #4, is denied; and it is further

ORDERED, that both petitions are dismissed.

This constitutes the Decision and Order of the Court.

E N T E R:

November 6, 2025
DATE

HON. CAROL SHARPE, J.S.C.
HON. CAROL SHARPE J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:	X	CASE DISPOSED		NON-FINAL DISPOSITION			
		GRANTED	X	DENIED		GRANTED IN PART		OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER				SUBMIT ORDER		
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN				FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT		REFERENCE