

BRUNELLO CUCINELLI

Litigation & Public Legal Proceedings Dossier

Comprehensive open-source court-record sweep | Research cutoff: September 3, 2026

Scope: Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A.; Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.; Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC; and substantially identical Cucinelli corporate-party names.

Prepared as a research dossier. Allegations are not findings of liability.

Important completeness statement

This report is designed to capture every distinct lawsuit and public legal proceeding that could be located through a broad open-internet search of indexed U.S. federal and state dockets, official agency/court materials, reported decisions, trademark proceedings, domain-name proceedings, corporate disclosures, and Italian/EU-oriented searches. It is not possible to certify that it contains literally every lawsuit ever filed worldwide. PACER requires paid access for some documents; many U.S. state systems are only partially indexed; sealed matters are unavailable; and Italian, European, Asian, and other foreign civil court databases are not uniformly searchable by corporate party on the open web. Accordingly, “not found” means not located in the public sources searched, not proof that no such matter exists.

The report deliberately does not inflate the count. Separate complaints arising from the same controversy are listed as separate filings but labeled as related/consolidated. Appeals are listed as appellate records rather than counted as new underlying controversies. Administrative matters and investigations are segregated from civil lawsuits.

Research result at a glance

Count	Category
12	distinct civil lawsuit filings located in which a Brunello Cucinelli entity was named as a defendant/appellee, including a separately filed case later consolidated into another action
2	U.S. Court of International Trade suits located in which a Cucinelli entity is the plaintiff
4+	public trademark/domain administrative proceedings located involving Brunello Cucinelli as applicant/complainant/opposer
Additional	regulatory, investigation, bankruptcy-creditor and related legal records that are not civil lawsuits and therefore are placed in a separate appendix

No distinct civil matter was located under the exact party name “Brunello Cucinelli North America.” The operative U.S. entities appearing in the located records are primarily Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc. and Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC.

Master index - lawsuits naming a Cucinelli entity as defendant/appellee

Filed	Case	Court	Docket	Category
2018-03-27	Fischler v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC et al.	E.D.N.Y.	1:18-cv-01846	ADA / accessibility
2019-03-12	Mary Matyas v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail, LLC	California state court	Public index did not expose number	Website accessibility / Unruh
2019-07-18	Sheila Biglang-Awa v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC	California state court	Public index did not expose number	Website accessibility / Unruh
2020-02-14	Giordano et al. v. Saks Incorporated et al.	E.D.N.Y.	1:20-cv-00833	Antitrust / alleged no-hire agreement
2020-04-10	Beachum v. Saks Incorporated et al.	E.D.N.Y.	1:20-cv-01769	Antitrust; consolidated into Giordano

Filed	Case	Court	Docket	Category
2022-04-21	Viridiana Quevedo v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC	L.A. Superior Court	22STLC02827	Civil rights / discrimination
2023-07-21	Fathmath v. EssilorLuxottica S.A. et al.	N.D. Cal.	3:23-cv-03626	Antitrust / eyewear
2024-06-27*	Center for Environmental Health v. The Kooples Bloom Inc., et al.	Alameda Superior Court	23CV045797	Prop. 65; Cucinelli added by amended complaint
2024-01-23	Levi Strauss & Co. v. Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. et al.	N.D. Cal.	4:24-cv-00399	Trademark infringement/dilution
2024	466 Saw Mill River Road, LLC v. Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.	Westchester Supreme Court, NY	66323/24	Commercial/property dispute; exact claims not publicly indexed
2025-06-05	Cynthia Petersen v. Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.	D. Nev.	2:25-cv-00997	Employment / age discrimination
2026-03-23	George Gardner v. Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc., et al.	L.A. Superior Court	26SMCV01514	Employment / discrimination

Part I - Civil lawsuits naming Cucinelli as defendant or appellee

1. Fischler v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC et al.

Filed	March 27, 2018
Court	U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York
Docket	1:18-cv-01846
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC
Nature of suit	Civil Rights: Americans with Disabilities - Other; class action
Judge	Nina Gershon

A federal disability-access action located through the Law360 docket index. This is a distinct lawsuit from the later California website-accessibility complaints.

Claims / allegations. The docket classification is an ADA civil-rights matter. The open index identifies the action as multiparty/class litigation; the accessible source does not expose the complete complaint allegations or final disposition.

Disposition / current status. Final disposition could not be reliably established from the open sources located. PACER may contain additional docket entries/documents.

Dossier note. Do not confuse this E.D.N.Y. docket number with unrelated cases bearing 1:18-cv-01846 in other federal districts.

Law360 docket: <https://www.law360.com/cases/5aba71afe2ecf57deb000001>

2. Mary Matyas v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail, LLC

Filed	March 12, 2019
Court	California state court
Docket	Not exposed by the public accessibility index located
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail, LLC
Category	Website accessibility / Unruh Civil Rights Act

A California disability-accessibility complaint challenging accessibility of shop.brunellocucinelli.com.

Claims / allegations. The public case summary reports alleged screen-reader and keyboard-access barriers, including missing alternative text, inaccessible forms, inadequate labels, empty links/headings and denial of keyboard access. The plaintiff asserted California Unruh Civil Rights Act claims and sought injunctive relief, statutory damages, fees and costs.

Disposition / current status. The public source located did not provide a final disposition or complete state-court docket number.

Accessibility.com case record: <https://www.accessibility.com/digital-lawsuits/mary-brunello-2019-03-12>

3. Sheila Biglang-Awa v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC

Filed	July 18, 2019
Court	California state court
Docket	Not exposed by the public accessibility index located
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC
Category	Website accessibility / Unruh Civil Rights Act

A separate California website-accessibility complaint filed by Sheila Biglang-Awa.

Claims / allegations. The public summary reports allegations that graphics, links and buttons lacked usable labels/alternative text; headings were insufficient; newsletter sign-up, product browsing and checkout were inaccessible to screen-reader users. The plaintiff asserted an Unruh Act claim.

Disposition / current status. The public source located did not provide a final disposition or complete state-court docket number.

Accessibility.com case record: <https://www.accessibility.com/digital-lawsuits/sheila-brunello-2019-07-18>

4. Giordano, Hayes & Wang et al. v. Saks Incorporated et al.

Filed	February 14, 2020
Court	U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York
Docket	1:20-cv-00833
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.
Category	Putative class action - Sherman Act / labor-market antitrust
Appeal	Second Circuit No. 23-600

Former Saks employees alleged Saks and several luxury brands, including Brunello Cucinelli USA, agreed not to compete for certain luxury-retail employees.

Claims / allegations. The amended complaint alleged a six-month no-hire restriction unless managers from both Saks and a brand agreed to an exception, allegedly depressing compensation and limiting employee mobility. The district court described one plaintiff as having applied to a Brunello Cucinelli boutique and not being hired.

Disposition / current status. The district court dismissed the amended complaint. The Second Circuit affirmed the dismissal on March 13, 2025 in No. 23-600-cv.

Dossier note. Allegations were contested and ultimately dismissed; they are not findings of antitrust liability.

DOJ Antitrust case page: <https://www.justice.gov/atr/case/susan-giordano-et-al-v-saks-company-llc-et-al>

District court order (ClassAction.org PDF): <https://www.classaction.org/media/giordano-et-al-v-saks-incorporated-et-al-order.pdf>

Second Circuit docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/circuit-courts/ca2/23-600>

Second Circuit decision mirror: <https://case-law.vlex.com/vid/giordan-v-saks-co-1074256439>

5. Beachum v. Saks Incorporated et al.

Filed	April 10, 2020
Court	U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York
Docket	1:20-cv-01769
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.
Category	Antitrust / alleged no-hire agreement

A separately filed action by Anja Beachum arising from the same alleged Saks/luxury-brand no-hire controversy.

Claims / allegations. The complaint asserted Sherman Act claims against Saks entities and luxury brands including Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.

Disposition / current status. The case was terminated May 7, 2020 after the parties adopted a unified schedule to incorporate the action into a consolidated complaint in Giordano, No. 1:20-cv-00833.

Dossier note. Counted as a distinct filed lawsuit but not as a separate factual controversy.

Justia federal docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/new-york/nyedce/1%3A2020cv01769/447192>

6. Viridiana Quevedo v. Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC

Filed	April 21, 2022
Court	Los Angeles County Superior Court
Docket	22STLC02827
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC
Category	Civil Rights/Discrimination (limited civil index)

A Los Angeles Superior Court matter publicly indexed as a civil-rights/discrimination case.

Claims / allegations. The accessible public docket index identifies the case category but does not expose enough of the complaint to responsibly characterize the underlying protected-class or factual allegations.

Disposition / current status. A request for dismissal was filed April 28, 2022. The index reports disposition as dismissed.

AICasePredict docket index: <https://aicasepredict.com/case/262686005/california/22STLC02827-Viridiana-Quevedo-Vs-Brunello-Cucinelli-Usa-Retail-Llc>

7. Fathmath v. EssilorLuxottica S.A. et al.

Filed	July 21, 2023
Court	U.S. District Court, Northern District of California
Docket	3:23-cv-03626
Parties	Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. and Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.
Category	Putative class action - antitrust / eyewear

A wide-ranging eyewear antitrust class action named approximately fifty corporate defendants, including both the Italian parent and U.S. Cucinelli entity.

Claims / allegations. Plaintiff alleged anticompetitive licensing, distribution and sales arrangements that caused consumers to overpay for premium-branded eyewear. Later multidistrict-litigation materials described Cucinelli entities among dismissed IP licensors/eyewear manufacturers and as alleged non-party co-conspirators.

Disposition / current status. The Cucinelli entities were dismissed/terminated from the original action; later MDL litigation continued against other defendants and referred to Cucinelli as non-party entities in the alleged scheme. This distinction is important: being alleged as a non-party co-conspirator is not the same as remaining a defendant.

Justia docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/california/candce/3%3A2023cv03626/415677>

Complaint PDF: <https://www.classaction.org/media/fathmath-v-essilorluxottica-sa-et-al.pdf>

In re Eyewear Antitrust Litigation order: <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/minnesota/mndce/0%3A2023cv03065/210906/121/>

JPML docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/multi-district/jpml/MDL%20NO.%203091/1635443>

8. Center for Environmental Health v. The Kooples Bloom Inc., et al. - Proposition 65

Original case filed	September 27, 2023
---------------------	--------------------

Cucinelli added	June 27, 2024 amended complaint
Court	Alameda County Superior Court
Docket	23CV045797
Party	Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.
Category	California Proposition 65 - hexavalent chromium in leather footwear

The Center for Environmental Health added Brunello Cucinelli USA to an existing Proposition 65 action after serving a March 8, 2024 60-day notice.

Claims / allegations. CEH alleged exposures to hexavalent chromium from leather footwear without a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.

Disposition / current status. Settled. The California Attorney General database reports a July 21, 2025 settlement and October 2, 2025 judgment. Total payments were \$70,000: \$9,084 non-contingent civil penalty, \$54,103 attorneys' fees/costs, and \$6,813 payment in lieu of penalty. Injunctive terms included supplier notices, reformulation/warnings and document retention.

Dossier note. The original action predates Cucinelli's addition; the date above separates the case's original filing from the amendment naming Cucinelli.

California AG Prop. 65 record: <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/60-day-notice-2024-00977>

Consent judgment PDF: <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/prop65/judgments/2024-00977J5719.pdf>

9. Levi Strauss & Co. v. Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. et al.

Filed	January 23, 2024
Court	U.S. District Court, Northern District of California
Docket	4:24-cv-00399 (also initially indexed as 3:24-cv-00399)
Parties	Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A.; Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.
Category	Trademark infringement / dilution

Levi Strauss sued the Italian and U.S. Cucinelli entities over garment pocket tabs.

Claims / allegations. Levi alleged Cucinelli used tabs confusingly similar to Levi's famous tab trademark, asserting federal trademark claims.

Disposition / current status. The parties settled; Levi voluntarily dismissed the action with prejudice in May 2024. Public reporting states settlement terms were not disclosed.

Justia docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/california/candce/4%3A2024cv00399/423791>

Bloomberg Law coverage: <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation/levi-seeks-dismissal-of-its-brunello-cucinelli-trademark-suit>

Law360 case index: <https://www.law360.com/cases/65b155c2abd6d45a5cddb0fd>

10. 466 Saw Mill River Road, LLC v. Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.

Filed	2024 (index/docket number indicates 2024)
Court	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Westchester County
Trial docket	66323/24
Appellate docket	Second Department No. 2025-14591
Party	Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc.
Category	Commercial/property dispute - exact complaint

This New York state matter concerns the entity/address associated with Cucinelli's Ardsley operations. It is an important additional lawsuit that does not appear in ordinary fashion-industry litigation searches.

Claims / allegations. The open court calendars and appellate records confirm the case title, Westchester Supreme Court origin, trial index 66323/24, an order dated November 10, 2025, and an appeal by Brunello Cucinelli USA. The underlying complaint and precise causes of action were not located in freely accessible indexed text, so this report does not speculate whether the dispute concerned rent, lease terms, ownership, or another commercial issue.

Disposition / current status. Brunello Cucinelli USA's appeal, Appellate Division Second Department No. 2025-14591, was withdrawn; the court granted the withdrawal on July 27, 2026 without costs or disbursements. The underlying trial-court status requires direct NYSCEF/Westchester docket review for full detail.

New York Law Journal calendar: <https://assets.alm.com/b1/b7/6b091f544bdbaf140cf257286e1f/nylj040126b.pdf>

Second Department calendar: https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/ad2/calendar/26calendars/June/CAMP_Publication_Calendar_20260618.pdf

Second Department withdrawal order: <https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/ad2/Handdowns/2026/Motions/M315019.pdf>

11. Cynthia Petersen v. Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.

Filed	June 5, 2025
Court	U.S. District Court, District of Nevada
Docket	2:25-cv-00997
Party	Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.
Category	Employment - age discrimination; 29 U.S.C. § 621 / ADEA

An employment discrimination action filed by Cynthia Petersen.

Claims / allegations. The federal docket's cause-of-action field identifies age discrimination under 29 U.S.C. § 621. The docket shows the parties later exchanged settlement proposals and requested an extension while engaged in global settlement discussions.

Disposition / current status. Plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal on September 22, 2025; the case was terminated the same day.

Justia docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/nevada/nvdce/2%3A2025cv00997/175086>

Stipulation/order discussing settlement talks: <https://docs.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/nevada/nvdce/2%3A2025cv00997/175086/6>

12. George Gardner v. Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc., et al.

Filed	March 23, 2026
Court	Los Angeles County Superior Court - Santa Monica
Docket	26SMCV01514
Defendants	Brunello Cucinelli, USA, Inc.; Jackie Layne; Does 1-10
Category	General employment / discrimination
Judge	Lisa K. Sepe-Wiesenfeld

A current Los Angeles employment lawsuit naming Brunello Cucinelli USA and an individual defendant.

Claims / allegations. The publicly indexed complaint summary identifies multiple employment causes of action, including sex/gender discrimination and mental-disability discrimination. The complete complaint

summary is paywalled in the located index, so this dossier does not expand beyond allegations visible in the public record.

Disposition / current status. The case was stayed by stipulation/order on April 29, 2026 pending mediation. A post-mediation status conference was scheduled for December 17, 2026. Trellis reported the docket last refreshed September 2, 2026.

Dossier note. Active/pending as of the research cutoff unless later docket activity not yet indexed changes the status.

Trellis docket: <https://trellis.law/case/26smcv01514/george-gardner-vs-brunello-cucinelli-usa-inc-et-al>

Part II - Appeals and follow-on court records

These are court records tied to an underlying lawsuit already counted above, so they are not counted as new underlying controversies.

Giordano v. Saks Incorporated - Second Circuit, No. 23-600

Appeal filed April 17, 2023 from the E.D.N.Y. dismissal. The Second Circuit affirmed on March 13, 2025. The U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division participated as amicus in support of plaintiffs-appellants.

Docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/circuit-courts/ca2/23-600>

DOJ: <https://www.justice.gov/atr/case/susan-giordano-et-al-v-saks-company-llc-et-al>

466 Saw Mill River Road, LLC v. Brunello Cucinelli USA, Inc. - Second Department, No. 2025-14591

Appeal from a Westchester Supreme Court order dated November 10, 2025. Brunello Cucinelli USA was the applicant that later withdrew the appeal; withdrawal was granted July 27, 2026.

N.Y. courts order: <https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/ad2/Handdowns/2026/Motions/M315019.pdf>

In re Eyewear Antitrust Litigation / MDL No. 3091

After Cucinelli was dismissed from the original Fathmath defendant group, later MDL materials continued to identify Cucinelli entities as alleged non-party co-conspirator/licensor entities. This is follow-on litigation context, not a separate lawsuit against Cucinelli.

JPML docket: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/multi-district/jpml/MDL%20NO.%203091/1635443>

D. Minn. transfer order: <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/minnesota/mndce/0%3A2023cv03065/210906/121/>

Part III - Proceedings brought by Brunello Cucinelli

1. 2011 - USPTO TTAB ex parte appeal, application 79076627

Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. appears as appellant/plaintiff in a TTAB ex parte appeal filed February 28, 2011. The Law360 TTAB index lists the matter as terminated. This is an administrative trademark proceeding, not a civil lawsuit.

Public record: https://www.law360.com/ttab_cases/58d65f5a24df9e66930001c2

2. 2018 - CAC-UDRP-101427, brunellocucinelli.shop

Cucinelli filed a UDRP complaint concerning brunellocucinelli.shop. The Czech Arbitration Court panel accepted the complaint and ordered transfer.

Public record: <https://udrp.adr.eu/decisions/detail?id=62faaeb1bfe30f8f4e0cda0c>

3. 2018 - WIPO D2018-1368

Cucinelli filed against Xiao Meichen / Chen xiao mei over brunellocucinelli.com and brunelloecucinelli.com. WIPO ordered transfer of both domains on August 15, 2018.

Public record: <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/decisions/text/2018/d2018-1368.html>

4. 2024 - TTAB Opposition No. 91289367

Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. opposed Brunello S.p.A.'s BRUNELLO application. Filed January 19, 2024; opposition sustained by default decision and terminated April 22, 2024.

Public record: <https://ttabvue.uspto.gov/ttabvue/v?pno=91289367&pty=OPP>

5. 2026 - Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. v. United States et al.

U.S. Court of International Trade No. 1:26-cv-02602, filed April 1, 2026 against the United States, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and Commissioner Rodney S. Scott.

Public record: <https://dockets.justia.com/browse/court-cit?page=58>

6. 2026 - Brunello Cucinelli USA Inc. v. United States et al.

U.S. Court of International Trade No. 1:26-cv-03754, filed August 25, 2026 against the United States, CBP and Commissioner Rodney S. Scott.

Public record: <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/circuit-courts/cit/1%3A2026cv03754>

Part IV - Other public legal/regulatory records (not counted as lawsuits)

2016 OSHA enforcement record

OSHA opened a complaint inspection June 2, 2016 at a Brunello Cucinelli USA facility in Brewster, New York. The record lists three violations (two serious), initial penalties of \$17,637, and current penalties of \$10,582 after informal settlement. Case closed October 24, 2016. This is administrative enforcement, not a civil lawsuit.

Source: https://www.osha.gov/ords/imis/establishment.inspection_detail?id=1152102.015

2026 Italian labor/supply-chain investigation

Reuters reported Italian police sought documents from nine luxury groups, including Cucinelli, in a labor-exploitation supply-chain investigation. Reuters reported that the companies, including Cucinelli, were not themselves under investigation and prosecutors had not requested judicial administration for them at that time.

Source: <https://www.reuters.com/business/italian-police-visit-fashion-firms-including-cucinelli-moncler-labour-probe-2026-07-16/>

Bankruptcy creditor references

Public bankruptcy filings can list Cucinelli as a creditor or payee. For example, a 2026 Chapter 11 creditor list identified Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. with an unsecured claim exceeding \$21 million; a 2020 debtor filing listed merchandise payments to Brunello Cucinelli USA Inc. These are not lawsuits filed against Cucinelli and are not counted above.

Source: <https://cases.stretto.com/public/x503/14398/PLEADINGS/1439801132680000001143.pdf>

Part V - Historical / international search findings and limitations

Italian-language searches were run for combinations of Brunello Cucinelli with causa, tribunale, sentenza, ricorso, contenzioso, controversia giudiziaria, Corte d'Appello and Corte di Cassazione, together with searches of EU-oriented sources. No additional identifiable civil judgment naming Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A. as a party was located in the indexed open-web results. This is not conclusive because Italian civil decisions are not comprehensively searchable by party name through a single open database.

The company's 2012 Italian IPO registration document stated that no tax litigation was then pending ("Non risultano contenziosi fiscali in essere"). This is useful historical negative evidence for tax disputes as of that disclosure date, but it does not establish an absence of all other civil litigation.

2012 registration document / prospectus: https://www.borsaitaliana.it/prospetti-informativi/1264pros_1_it.pdf

The 2024 consolidated report discusses litigation/class-action risk as a business risk but the indexed text located did not identify a historical list of material court cases. Public corporate reporting therefore did not supply additional named historical lawsuits in the search.

2024 consolidated report:

https://investor.brunellocucinelli.com/yep-content/media/Bilancio_Consolidato_2024_comprensivo_della_Rendicontazione_Consolidata_di_Sostenibilita%CC%80.pdf

Part VI - Search methodology

- Entity-name variants searched: "Brunello Cucinelli," "Brunello Cucinelli S.p.A.," "Brunello Cucinelli USA," "Brunello Cucinelli USA Inc.," "Brunello Cucinelli USA Retail LLC," and "Brunello Cucinelli North America."
- U.S. sources searched or cross-checked included Justia Dockets, Law360 case indexes, federal reported-decision mirrors, DOJ Antitrust materials, California Attorney General Proposition 65 records, California/Los Angeles case indexes, New York court calendars/Appellate Division orders, USPTO TTABVue, and JPML materials.
- International/administrative sources included WIPO UDRP decisions, Czech Arbitration Court UDRP decisions, Italian-language web searches, Borsa Italiana historical offering documents and Cucinelli investor disclosures.
- Issue-specific searches were run for employment, discrimination, wage, ADA/accessibility, antitrust, trademark, copyright, patent, contract, premises liability, personal injury, Proposition 65, class action, customs and regulatory matters.
- Year-by-year searches were run across older periods to reduce recency bias. Duplicate news stories were not counted as separate cases. Separate docketed complaints were retained even when later consolidated, with consolidation clearly marked.

Part VII - Verification checklist for counsel or formal case use

For evidentiary or legal-strategy use, the next verification layer should be direct docket pulls from PACER, NYSCEF, Los Angeles Superior Court, Alameda Superior Court and other relevant state systems. In particular, the full complaints and dismissal papers for the 2018 Fischler case, the 2019 Matyas and Biglang-Awa cases, and the complaint/order history in 466 Saw Mill River Road should be obtained from the official court systems. Those direct records may expose factual detail not indexed on the public web and may reveal additional related filings, cross-claims or settlement entries.

This dossier is research, not legal advice. A filing or allegation does not establish wrongdoing, and dismissed/settled matters should be described with their procedural posture.