

ADMITTED TO PRACTICE IN:  
NEW YORK; NEW JERSEY;  
UNITED STATES SUPREME  
COURT; UNITED STATES  
COURTS OF APPEALS FOR THE  
SECOND AND THIRD CIRCUITS;  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
COURTS FOR THE SOUTHERN  
AND EASTERN DISTRICTS OF  
NEW YORK; DISTRICT OF NEW  
JERSEY; DISTRICT OF  
CONNECTICUT; NORTHERN  
DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS;  
UNITED STATES COURT OF  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE;  
COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.

**JAMES M. MALONEY**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW**  
**PROCTOR IN ADMIRALTY**



P.O. Box 551  
33 BAYVIEW AVENUE  
PORT WASHINGTON, NY 11050

TEL: (516) 767-1395  
FAX: (516) 767-1326

E-MAIL ADDRESSES:  
**jmm80@earthlink.net**  
**maritimelaw@nyu.edu**

April 21, 2006

**ORIGINAL FILED VIA ECF**

Hon. Arthur D. Spatt  
United States District Court Judge  
United States District Court, E.D.N.Y.  
Central Islip, New York 11722

Re: *Maloney v. Spitzer, et al.* (CV- 03-786) (ADS) (MLO)

Honorable Sir:

I am the *pro se* plaintiff in the above-captioned case. This letter is being sent following a conference today among myself and the attorneys for all defendants, in satisfaction of Magistrate Judge Orenstein's Status Conference Order dated April 11, 2006 (Document 61 on the docket sheet, a true copy of which is annexed to the courtesy copy of this letter). The parties have agreed to the following briefing schedule:

<u>Papers</u>	<u>Date to be served</u>
Rule 12(b) Motion by Defendants Pataki and Spitzer	[already served]
Plaintiff's Response to 12(b) Motion	Tuesday, June 6, 2006
Rule 12(c) Motion by Defendant Dillon/Rice	Tuesday, June 6, 2006
Plaintiff's Response to 12(c) Motion	Thursday, July 6, 2006
Reply on 12(b) Motion by Defendants Pataki and Spitzer	Thursday, July 6, 2006
Reply on Rule 12(c) Motion by Defendant Dillon/Rice	Monday, August 7, 2006

Plaintiff has decided not to make a Rule 56 motion for summary judgment within the above briefing schedule.

Respectfully,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s  
James M. Maloney

cc (via ECF): Dorothy Oehler Nese, Esq., Liora M. Ben-Sorek, Esq.