## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT:	ALICE SCH		PARA PART 16	
Index Number : NEW YORK ST vs. RICE, KATHLEI SEQUENCE NU RENEW/REARGI	ATE SENATE EN IMBER : 003		INDEX NO MOTION DATE MOTION SEQ. NO:	
		vere read on this motion to/for		
	rder to Show Cause — Affid	lavits — Exhlbits	No(s)	
			No(s) No(s)	
Upon the foregoin	ng papers, it is ordered that	at this motion is devi-		
accord	ance with	h the acco Lecesion.	mpanying	
REASON(S):				
FOLLC				
FOR THE FOLLOWING				
Dated:DEC	232014		ALICE SCHLESINGER	
1. CHECK ONE:			NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	
2. CHECK AS APPROPRIATE	MOTION	IS: GRANTED		
3. CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		SETTLE ORDER	SUBMIT ORDER	

## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK

NEW YORK STATE SENATE, NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLY, DEAN G. SKELOS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-----X

Index No. 160941/13 Motion Seq. 003

-against-

KATHLEEN RICE, WILLIAM J. FITZPATRICK, and MILTON L. WILLIAMS, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

SCHLESINGER, J.:

This litigation relates to a Commission formed by Governor Andrew M. Cuomo in July 2013 to investigate various issues relating to government ethics, conflicts of interest, and campaign finance. As part of that investigation, the Commission issued subpoenas to certain law firms and businesses that employ New York legislators. In response, some of the subpoenaed entities commenced litigation to quash the subpoenas.

While that litigation was pending, Governor Cuomo announced that he was ending the Commission's investigation and disbanding the Commission. The parties agreed that the Governor's decision rendered the pending litigation moot and further agreed to discontinue the litigation. This Court "So Ordered" various Stipulations to that effect under the various index numbers for the cases on April 30, 2014.

Shortly before that date, Elena Sassower, representing herself, filed an Order to Show Cause to intervene in the proceedings. The Court heard argument on the proposed Order to Show Cause on April 28, 2014. On April 30, 2014, the same date that this Court approved the Stipulations of Discontinuance, the Court issued a decision and order declining to sign the Order to Show Cause, reasoning that no viable action remained in which Ms. Sassower could intervene. That decision was served with Notice of Entry on or about May 13, 2014.

Before the Court at this time is a motion by Ms. Sassower to renew and reargue this Court's decision dated April 30, 2014 declining to sign her proposed Order to Show Cause.. Various parties to this action have opposed the motion. After hearing extensive oral argument in open court on December 3, 2014, this Court denies the motion in its entirety.

Motions to renew and reargue are governed by CPLR §2221. 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." CPLR §2221(e). A motion to reargue "shall be based upon matters of fact or law allegedly overlooked or misapprehended by the court in determining the prior motion ...". CPLR §2221(d).

After reviewing the papers and carefully considering the arguments presented orally and in writing, this Court finds that Ms. Sassower has failed to satisfy either standard in CPLR §2221. Thus, no basis exists for this Court to reconsider or change the April 30, 2014 order.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion by the proposed intervenor Elena Sassower to renew and reargue is in all respects denied.

Dated: December 23, 2014

DEC 232014

ALICE SCHLESINGER