
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Orders Effective as of June 16, 2025¹

¹ This Compendium contains only Administrative Orders in effect which affect the practice of law and are relevant to practitioners. Orders that relate to court governance or administrative matters are not included herein.

CONTENTS

Expiration of Prior Administrative Orders, No. 2025-04.....	1
Courthouse Security and Limitations on the Use of Electronic Devices, No. 2025-02.....	2
Redaction of Signatures and Identifying Information of Grand Jurors, No. 2024-08.....	4
Retroactive Application of Amendment 821, No. 2023-31.....	5
District Assignment of Civil Cases to Magistrate Judges, No. 2023-23.....	7
Passports and Travel Documents as a Condition of Pretrial Release, No. 2023-15.....	10
Modification of Condition of Supervision (Third-Party Risk), No. 2021-03.....	12
Procedures for Highly Sensitive Documents, No. 2021-02.....	14
Student Practice Rule, No. 2019-07.....	18
Referral of Matters to the Bankruptcy Judges.....	19
Pending Motions, No. 2001-04.....	20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

In Re:
EXPIRATION OF PRIOR ADMINISTRATIVE
ORDERS

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2025-04**

-----X

This Administrative Order deems the previously issued Administrative Orders issued by the Board of Judges as withdrawn and no longer in effect:

1. Administrative Order 2004-05 governing the filing of sealed documents on ECF. Parties should follow the ECF instructions available on the Court's website here: https://www.nyed.uscourts.gov/forms/all-forms/ecf_instructions
2. Administrative Order 2004-09 governing the redaction of personal information from court filings. Parties are directed to follow Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2 which governs such redaction.
3. Administrative Order 2007-10 governing electronic devices in courthouses. The policies governing such devices are found in Local Civil Rule 1.8 and Administrative Order No. 2025-02.
4. Administrative Order 2008-05 and Administrative Order 2023-06 governing the deadlines for filing briefs in social security cases. These deadlines are now contained in Local Supplemental Social Security Rules.
5. Administrative Order 2014-05, governing the referral to and authority of magistrate judges in grand jury proceedings. These matters are now contained in Division of Business Rule 6(b).

SO ORDERED:

Dated: May 30, 2025
Brooklyn, New York

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

In Re:
Courthouse Security and Limitations on the Use of
Electronic Devices Within the United States
Courthouses in the Eastern District of New York
-----X

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2025-02**

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Judicial Conference Policy, and Local Civil Rule 1.8 prohibit the taking of photographs, recordings, and broadcasting of judicial proceedings.¹ Local Civil Rule 1.8 also prohibits anyone other than court officials engaged in the conduct of court business from bringing any camera, transmitter, receiver, recording device, cellular telephone, computer, or other electronic device into any courthouse, unless authorized to do so by an administrative or standing order of the court, the clerk, or the district executive.² Administrative Order 2007-10 permits attorneys presenting appropriate verification of bar membership to enter the courthouses of the Eastern District of New York in possession of Personal Digital Assistants (“PDAs”), laptop computers, and cellular telephones, while retaining the authority of a district judge or magistrate judge to curtail or permit the presence or use of such devices as circumstances may warrant.³

As technology has advanced, there is an increasing number of devices that have the capability of recording and/or transmitting photographs, audio, and video. Currently, these devices include, but are not limited to, smart phones, PDAs, laptops, tablets, and wearable technology such as watches, jewelry, and eyeglasses.

In order to enforce the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Judicial Conference Policy, and the Local Rules, this administrative order sets forth the limitations on the use of electronic devices in the United States Courthouses within the Eastern District of New York and the relevant screening procedures that will be enforced by the United States Marshals Service and Court Security Officers. This administrative order applies to all existing and emerging technology that has the capability of recording and/or transmitting photographs, audio, and video and refers to all such devices as electronic devices.

¹ Fed. R. Crim. P. 53 provides “Except as otherwise provided by a statute or these rules, the court must not permit the taking of photographs in the courtroom during judicial proceedings or the broadcasting of judicial proceedings from the courtroom.” Judicial Conference Policy “does not allow either civil or criminal courtroom proceedings in the district courts to be broadcast, televised, recorded, or photographed for the purpose of public dissemination.” Guide to Judiciary Policy, Vol. 10, Ch. 4 § 410(a). Local Civil Rule 1.8 states: “Proceedings may not be broadcast or streamed unless authorized by the presiding judge in accordance with Judicial Conference policy.” Local Rules of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Local Civ. R. 1.8(b).

² Local Civil R. 1.8.

³ Administrative Order 2007-10 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2007).

- (1) No person may bring electronic devices into the courthouse except:
 - a. Court officials engaged in the conduct of court business;
 - b. Attorneys presenting appropriate verification of bar membership;
 - c. Law enforcement officers with appropriate credentials, and
 - d. Persons authorized to do so by an order of the court, the clerk, or the district executive.
- (2) All persons entering the courthouse are subject to appropriate screening and search by the United States Marshals Service or Court Security Officers.
 - a. Attorneys presenting appropriate verification of bar membership, law enforcement with appropriate credentials, and persons authorized by an order of the court, the clerk, or the district executive to bring electronic devices must submit all electronic devices and other items carried by them for screening. After the screening, such persons may retain their electronic devices.
 - b. All other persons must turn off all electronic devices and give them to the Court Security Officers prior to screening. The Court Security Officers will store the electronic devices and provide a numbered claim ticket so that the devices can be retrieved when leaving the courthouse.

This administrative order does not limit in any way the authority of a district, magistrate or bankruptcy judge to curtail or permit the presence or use of such devices as circumstances may warrant. In accordance with the rules explained above, the use of any form of photographic, video and audio recording in the courthouse are strictly forbidden. Violations of this order may result in court-imposed sanctions, including, but not limited to, fines and forfeiture of the privileges hereby extended.

SO ORDERED:

Dated: March 31, 2025
Brooklyn, New York

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

In Re:
Redaction of Signatures and Identifying Information
of Grand Jurors

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2024-08**

-----X

Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure sets limits on the disclosure of matters occurring before a grand jury. Grand jury secrecy has been construed to extend to the identity of grand jurors themselves. In light of that and to ensure the privacy and safety of grand jurors, effective May 15, 2024, the Clerk of Court is directed, as to any document containing the signature or other identifying information of a grand juror that is filed in a case and not sealed in its entirety to:

- (1) file publicly a copy of the document with the signature and identifying information of the grand juror redacted. If feasible, the redaction of any signature should be sufficient to obscure the identity of the signer but not the fact that the document was signed; and
- (2) maintain an unredacted copy of the document under seal, with access restricted to Court personnel.

The Court finds that this policy is consistent with the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents because the redactions are limited to what is necessary to protect grand jury secrecy and the “privacy interests” of grand jurors, *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 120 (2d Cir. 2006), and because the presiding judge in an individual case may, if the circumstances warrant it, order that any document in the case be unsealed.

SO ORDERED:

Dated: May 15, 2024
Brooklyn, New York

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
In re RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF
AMENDMENT 821 U.S. SENTENCING
GUIDELINES MANUAL
-----X

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2023-31**

Pursuant to the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act, Title 18, U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(1) and (c), the Federal Defenders of New York (“Federal Defenders”) is hereby appointed to represent any defendant previously determined to have been entitled to appointment of counsel, or who previously was represented by retained counsel and presently is indigent, to determine whether that defendant may qualify to seek reduction of sentence and to present any motions or applications for reduction of sentence in accordance with Amendment 821 of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual. In addition, should the Federal Defenders determine that there is a conflict with regard to the representation of a particular defendant, the assigned district judge or the on-duty magistrate judge is authorized to appoint a member of the Criminal Justice Act (“CJA”) panel to represent that defendant. CJA panel attorneys who previously were appointed to represent defendants may, upon the CJA attorney’s request, resume their appointment to investigate and pursue any similar claims for their clients.

The United States Probation Office (“the Probation Office”) and the United States District Court Clerk’s Office for the Eastern District of New York (“the Clerk’s Office”) are authorized to disclose Presentence Investigation Reports, Judgments (including sealed judgments), and Statements of Reasons to the Federal Defenders and the United States Attorney’s Office for the purpose of determining eligibility for relief. The Clerk’s Office is further authorized to disclose to the Federal Defenders motions for downward departures based on substantial assistance for any defendant the Federal Defenders represented at the time of the original sentencing. If such a motion was filed under seal and the defendant was not previously represented by the Federal Defenders, the Clerk’s Office shall instead disclose the motion to the United States Attorney’s Office. Otherwise, applications for access to sealed documents for the purpose of determining whether to file, or filing, a motion on behalf of the defendant seeking relief under Amendment 821 for reduction of sentence are to be directed to the assigned district judge. Any sealed document provided to defense counsel by the Probation Office, Clerk’s Office, or United States Attorney’s Office pursuant to this Administrative Order shall be maintained under seal and shall not be used or disclosed for any purpose other than to determine a defendant’s eligibility to seek a reduction of sentence or present any motions or applications for reduction of sentence in accordance with Amendment 821, or to determine whether there exists any conflict in representation.

The Clerk’s Office shall promptly notify Federal Defenders and the assigned district judge of all *pro se* motions seeking or appearing to seek relief under Amendment 821. If the Probation Office receives or otherwise becomes aware of any such pending motions, that Office similarly shall so advise Federal Defenders and the assigned district judge.

In the event that the sentencing judge in the original proceeding is no longer a member of the Bench of this District, the case shall be reassigned on a random basis.

SO ORDERED:

Dated: November 1, 2023
Brooklyn, New York

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
In re DIRECT ASSIGNMENT OF CIVIL CASES TO
MAGISTRATE JUDGES
-----X

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2023-23**

This Administrative Order governs a two-year pilot program, approved by the Eastern District of New York Board of Judges concerning the assignment of civil cases to Magistrate Judges.

The program will commence on September 25, 2023, and terminate on September 25, 2025, unless extended by the Board of Judges. During the pendency of the program, the terms of this Administrative Order supersede any conflicting Division of Business Rule. Pursuant to the program, in a percentage of civil cases determined by the Board of Judges, a Magistrate Judge will be assigned as the sole judge on the matter at the time of case initiation, except that a Magistrate Judge will not be assigned to any bankruptcy appeals, or any case where the case-initiating document is a motion for preliminary injunction or temporary restraining order.

In those cases where an assignment solely to a Magistrate Judge has been made:

- (1) For the Magistrate Judge to remain the presiding judge — including for the purposes of deciding all dispositive motions, holding trial, and entering judgment — all parties must file a written consent form consenting to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge no later than thirty (30) days following the Rule 16 initial case management conference.
- (2) In cases exempt from Rule 16 scheduling orders — pursuant to Local Rule 16.1 — all parties must file a consent form no later than thirty (30) days following the appearance of all defendants, except that in an action:
 - a. Under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the deadline will be 30 days following the notification to the Commissioner, as provided in Social Security Supplemental Rule 3; and
 - b. Involving a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, the deadline will be 30 days following the deadline to file an answer to the petition.
- (3) If a consent form, signed by all parties, is not filed by the relevant date provided in (1) or (2), the Clerk will randomly assign a District Judge to serve as the presiding judge. The Magistrate Judge initially assigned will remain on the case, to handle all pretrial case management duties, consistent with Local Rule 72.1, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), except that in those matters governed by subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b) above, the Magistrate Judge assignment will be removed. Any Rule 16 scheduling order initially set by the Magistrate Judge will remain in place, and the

Magistrate Judge so assigned is empowered to act with respect to all non-dispositive pretrial matters unless the assigned District Judge orders otherwise.

- (4) If a party intends to file a motion for judgment on the pleadings, summary judgment, to dismiss for failure to state a claim or any relief under Rule 12(b), to involuntarily dismiss the case, or for injunctive relief (other than a motion for preliminary injunctive relief or a temporary restraining order) and all parties have not yet consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge, the party seeking such relief must file, no later than any date specified by any Federal or Local Rule governing the timing of such a motion, a letter no longer than one (1) page expressing such intent. The Clerk will then randomly assign a District Judge to serve as the presiding judge in the case. The party will, no later than seven (7) days after such assignment, file either a pre-motion letter or a motion as provided for in the District Judge's Individual Practices, or pursuant to any order issued by the District Judge.¹
- (5) In any case where a party files a motion for a preliminary injunction or temporary restraining order, unless a consent form signed by all parties (including all defendants) has been filed, the Clerk will assign the case to a District Judge upon filing of such motion.
- (6) Notwithstanding the assignment of a District Judge, the parties may still consent at any time to the Court reassigning the case to a Magistrate Judge for final decision on any motion, or for all purposes, including entry of final judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). A party may also withhold its consent without any adverse consequences. For social security or habeas corpus matters where the initial assignment of a Magistrate Judge has been removed following assignment to a District Judge, and there has been a subsequent consent form filed, the Clerk will randomly reassign a Magistrate Judge to preside over the case.

In any case where (1) denial of an *in forma pauperis* application; (2) dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) or § 1915A; (3) dismissal for failure to pay the filing fee or other deficiency identified by the Clerk; (4) dismissal of a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition pursuant to Habeas Rule 4, without requiring an answer from the respondent; or (5) entry of default against a non-appearing defendant is appropriate, a District Judge may be assigned at any time to serve as the presiding judge.

During the pendency of this pilot program, the Clerk is empowered to issue orders pursuant to Federal Rule 73(b) informing the parties of their rights to consent to a Magistrate Judge, and their ability to withhold consent. For cases where there is no District Judge assigned,

¹ For motions implicating Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A) or similar time-limiting rules, if any party concludes in good faith that delaying the filing of a motion, in order to comply with any aspect of this Administrative Order, will deprive the party of a substantive right, the party may file the motion within the time required by the Federal Rules of Civil and/or Appellate Procedure, together with an explanation of the basis for the conclusion.

the procedures for executing a consent form contained in Local Rule 73.1(b) will continue to apply, except that upon filing of a consent form signed by all parties, the Clerk will forward the form to the Chief Judge, or to a District Judge designated by the Chief Judge, for signature.

SO ORDERED:

Dated: August 25, 2023
Brooklyn, New York

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
IN RE:
DISPOSITION OF PASSPORTS AND TRAVEL
DOCUMENTS SURRENDERED AS A CONDITION
OF PRETRIAL RELEASE
-----X

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2023-15**

Whereas, the authority to impose upon a defendant the surrender of travel documents as a condition of pretrial release is governed by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c)(1)(B)(xiv); and

Whereas, the disposition of surrendered passports is governed by the *Guide to Judiciary Policy, Volume 8, Part C, Chapter 5*; it is hereby

ORDERED that passports and travel documents surrendered as a condition of pretrial release or otherwise surrendered pursuant to the investigation and prosecution of a matter pending before this Court shall be disposed of by Pretrial Services as follows:

- (1) Passports and travel documents will be returned to all defendants whose case was disposed of via dismissal or acquittal;
- (2) In all other cases, Pretrial Services shall hold all surrendered passports and/or travel documents for the shorter of:
 - a. Ninety (90) days following termination of the pretrial release order, or
 - b. Until reclaimed;
- (3) To reclaim a surrendered passport or travel document pursuant to (1) above, a defendant or their designated representative shall file a request with the Court asking the Court to issue an order that the passport or travel document be returned, or, where applicable, that such be transferred to the United States Probation Office;
- (4) After the ninety-day period has elapsed, Pretrial Services shall transfer all unclaimed passports and/or travel documents to the U.S. Department of State, the issuing agency, or the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration, and Customs Enforcement, as applicable, in accordance with the *Guide to Judiciary Policy, Volume 8, Part C, Chapter 5, Section 535.45.20*;
- (5) Prior to sentencing, Pretrial Services shall ensure that defendants and their counsel are provided with notice of how a defendant's passport or travel documents will be disposed of and the ninety-day period during which they may request that the aforementioned documents be returned;
- (6) A defendant or their representative's request that the Court issue an order to return a passport or other travel document shall be entered into the chronological record and the

U.S. Attorney's Office shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to respond to the request;

- (7) No passport held as a condition of bail may be used as evidence by or disclosed to the prosecution without the permission of the Court;
- (8) Pretrial Services shall otherwise comply with the procedures set forth in the *Guide to Judiciary Policy, Volume 8, Part C, Chapter 5, Section 535.45.20*;
- (9) Should counsel in a specific case wish to seek a modification of this policy based on individual circumstances, they may make such a request to the assigned Judge, who shall retain discretion to set individualized procedures for the disposition of travel documents surrendered by a defendant as a condition of pretrial release.

Dated: May 8, 2023
Brooklyn, New York

SO ORDERED:

s/ MKB

MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

IN RE:

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
NO. 2021-03**

MODIFICATION OF THE STANDARD CONDITION
OF SUPERVISION PERTAINING TO THIRD-PARTY
RISK

-----X

WHEREAS, Standard Condition #12 of the Standard Conditions of Supervised Release currently included in this Court's Judgment in a Criminal Case ("Current Standard Condition #12") reads as follows:

If the probation officer determines that you pose a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer may require you to notify the person about the risk and you must comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that you have notified the person about the risk;

and

WHEREAS, in *United States v. Boles*, 914 F.3d 95 (2d Cir. 2019), the Second Circuit held that the language used in Current Standard Condition #12 impermissibly accords too much discretion to the probation officer; and

WHEREAS, in light of *Boles*, the Court intends that all defendants upon whom Current Standard Condition Number #12 was imposed should be relieved of that condition immediately, and without the need for motion practice or further judicial proceedings;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby

ORDERED that all judgments entered in this Court in which Current Standard Condition #12 was imposed are hereby modified to remove from the judgment Current Standard Condition #12, and any defendant who was sentenced subject to Current Standard Condition #12 is immediately relieved from the requirements of said condition; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the form used in this Court for any Judgment in a Criminal Case be modified to incorporate a new standard third-party risk condition ("Revised Standard Condition #12") as follows:

If the probation officer determines based on your criminal record, personal history and characteristics, and the nature and circumstances of your offense, you pose a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer, with prior

approval of the Court, may require you to notify the person about the risk and you must comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that you have notified the person about the risk;

and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in any case, including any case with a judgment affected by this Order, in which the probation officer believes that a third-party risk condition is warranted, the probation officer shall recommend to the Court that Revised Standard Condition #12 be imposed, and, if the Court accepts the recommendation, Revised Standard Condition #12 shall be imposed.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
February 10, 2021

S/Margo K. Brodie
MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
IN RE: PROCEDURES FOR HIGHLY
SENSITIVE DOCUMENTS
-----X

AMENDED
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
2021-02

MARGO K. BRODIE, Chief Judge

WHEREAS, in response to recent disclosures of widespread breaches of both private sector and government computer systems, federal courts are immediately adding new security procedures to protect highly sensitive documents filed with the courts, the Court finds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d)(3)(A) and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 49(b)(3)(A), good cause exists to require all parties to file highly sensitive documents, as defined herein, outside of the Court's electronic filing system.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, effective as of the date of this order and until such time as the Court orders otherwise, the filing of certain highly sensitive documents, as defined herein, shall be subject to the procedures and requirements set forth below. This Administrative Order supersedes any and all inconsistent provisions in existing local rules, administrative procedures, or other general orders of this Court. This Administrative Order does not limit or preclude the filing of documents under seal in accordance with existing procedures.

1. Documents Subject to this Order. The filing procedures and descriptions set forth below apply to documents known as Highly Sensitive Documents ("HSDs").

- a. HSDs are not all documents containing sensitive, proprietary or confidential information. Applications for search warrants, applications for the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications under 18 U.S.C. § 2518, and applications for pen registers, trap and trace devices, and wiretaps, are also not necessarily HSDs. Similarly, presentence reports or

related documents, pleadings related to cooperation in criminal cases, social security administrative records, immigration administrative records, and most sealed documents in civil cases are not HSDs. Instead, HSDs are those documents containing information that (a) is likely to be of interest to the intelligence service of a foreign government, or the disclosure of which could cause significant harm to the United States or its interests, or (b) the disclosure of which could put human life or safety at risk. Examples of HSDs are documents involving national security, cybersecurity, terrorism, investigation of public officials, the reputational interests of the United States, and extremely sensitive commercial information likely to be of interest to foreign powers as well as documents revealing the cooperation of witnesses whose lives could be endangered by public disclosure.

- b. If a filer believes that the documents to be filed on ECF are HSDs, the filer shall file a motion to designate the documents as HSDs as provided in Section 2 below.
- c. Non-HSDs shall continue to be filed under existing sealing procedures.
- d. Whether a document is an HSD shall be determined by the presiding District or Magistrate Judge assigned to a case or motion. A judge may decide *sua sponte* to treat any document as an HSD, whether or not a party has sought such designation. All documents submitted pursuant to this Order shall be treated as HSDs pending a judicial determination.
- e. If a document is not designated as an HSD, the filer retains the ability to file such a document in the Court's CM/ECF system under seal in accordance with local rules and administrative procedures.

2. Filing of Motions to Treat a Document as an HSD

- a. Any filer seeking to have a document treated as an HSD shall file a motion to designate a document as an HSD. The motion to designate AND the proposed HSD shall **not** be filed electronically but rather pursuant to the procedures in Section 3 below.
- b. The motion to designate the document as an HSD shall set forth why the proposed document constitutes an HSD under the criteria set forth above or why it should otherwise be subject to the heightened protection for HSDs.
- c. The Court will issue an order on the motion and,
 - i. if granted, an informational entry will be made on the case docket indicating that the motion to designate and the HSD have been filed with the Court. The Clerk's Office will maintain the motion to designate and the HSD in a secure paper filing system or a secure standalone computer system that is not connected to any network. To the extent a party seeks to have the informational entry sealed, the request should be made in the motion to designate.
 - ii. if denied, and after any appeal of any denial of a motion to designate is exhausted, the filer may file the document using existing procedures via CM/ECF.

3. Procedures for Filing an HSD

- a. The filing party shall deliver to the Clerk's Office (in-person) paper copies of the motion to designate and the proposed HSD. In addition, one copy and any additional courtesy copies required by the District or Magistrate Judge assigned to the case or motion, must be provided to that judge according to his or her

requirements.

- b. The upper right portion of the motion and the proposed HSD shall be labeled “SEALED” and “HSD.”
- c. The documents shall be submitted to the Clerk’s Office in a sealed envelope marked “HIGHLY SENSITIVE DOCUMENT.” The outside of the envelope shall be affixed with a copy on the HSD Cover Sheet provided on the Court’s Website.

4. Removal of Existing HSDs from the Court’s Electronic Filing System

- a. A party may make a motion to remove an HSD or, upon its own motion, a Judge may determine that a document that has been filed electronically is an HSD and direct that the HSD be removed from the Court’s electronic filing system and maintained by the Clerk’s Office in a secure paper filing system.
- b. A motion to remove an HSD from the Court’s electronic filing system shall identify the specific document number to be designated as an HSD and set forth why such document is highly sensitive under the criteria set out in Section 1 or why it should otherwise be subject to the heightened protection for HSDs. Such a motion shall be filed as indicated in Sections 2 and 3.

5. Questions about HSD Filing Procedures. Any questions about how an HSD should be filed with the Court pursuant to this Administrative Order should be directed to the Clerk’s Office at (718) 613-2285 or (631) 712-6010.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 04, 2021
Brooklyn, New York

S/Margo K. Brodie
MARGO K. BRODIE
Chief Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
In Re:
ADOPTION OF A STUDENT PRACTICE RULE
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----X

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER
No. 2019-07**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the following Eastern District of New York Student Practice Rule is adopted.

Eastern District of New York Student Practice Rule

- (a) An eligible law student may appear in a criminal matter under the supervision of the U.S. Attorney's Office or the Federal Defenders Office (or its affiliated law school clinic), or in any civil matter, subject to the Court's approval and the conditions set forth below. A judge's decision to decline a student's request to appear shall not be considered a reflection on the character or ability of the student.
- (b) To be eligible to appear, the student shall:
- (1) be enrolled in a law school accredited by the American Bar Association;
 - (2) have completed at least two semesters of legal studies;
 - (3) be a participant in a clinical program approved by the law school where the student is enrolled, be certified by the dean of that law school or his or her designee as qualified to participate in providing legal representation as contemplated by this rule, or be working in the United States Attorney's Office or the Federal Defenders Office;
 - (4) be familiar and comply with the applicable Federal Rules of Criminal and Civil Procedure and Evidence and the New York Rules of Professional Conduct; and
 - (5) be supervised by an attorney as set forth below in paragraph (c).
- (c) An attorney who supervises an eligible law student shall:
- (1) be a member of the bar of this Court;
 - (2) assume personal professional responsibility for the student's work;
 - (3) assist the student to the extent necessary;
 - (4) appear with the student in all proceedings before the Court;
 - (5) obtain the client's approval, in writing, for the student to appear in the matter; and
 - (6) obtain the Court's approval for the student to appear in the matter.
- (d) A law student who is supervised in accordance with this rule:
- (1) may appear in court and at other proceedings when accompanied by a supervising attorney;
 - (2) may prepare and sign motions, petitions, answers, briefs, and other documents, provided that each such document also shall be signed by the supervising attorney; and
 - (3) may not ask for or receive any compensation or remuneration of any kind for services from the person on whose behalf the student renders services or appears, but this provision shall not prevent an attorney, legal aid bureau, law school, public defender agency, a State or the United States from paying compensation to the eligible law student.

Dated: Brooklyn, NY
August 30, 2019

/s

DORA L. IRIZARRY
CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

In the Matter

of

ORDER

The Referral of Matters to the Bankruptcy
Judges

-----X

WHEREAS 28 U.S.C. § 157(a) provides that each district court may refer any or all cases under Title 11 and any or all proceedings arising under Title 11, or arising in or related to a case under Title 11, and

WHEREAS, by Order of this Court on August 28, 1986, all such cases and proceedings are referred to the Bankruptcy Judges for this District,

It is hereby


ORDERED that if a bankruptcy judge or district judge determines that a bankruptcy judge cannot enter a final order or judgment consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution in a particular proceeding referred under this order and designated as core under section 157(b) of title 28, unless the district court orders otherwise, the bankruptcy judge shall hear the proceeding and submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the district court, and it is further

ORDERED that the district court may treat any order or judgment of the bankruptcy court as proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law in the event that the district court concludes that a bankruptcy judge could not enter that order or judgment consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution, and it is further

ORDERED that this Order shall be given effect nunc pro tunc as of June 23, 2011.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York

Dec. 5, 2012


Carol Bagley Amor
Chief Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

In re: PENDING MOTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE
ORDER
2001-4

-----X

At a meeting of the Board of Judges held on February 20, 2001, the Court adopted the following statement as an Administrative Order:

“Any party may write to inform the presiding judicial officer with notice to all parties of particular problems presented by the pendency of an undecided motion. Any such submission will be considered, although no party should expect a direct response.”

This Order is effective immediately.

SO ORDERED.

Edward R. Korman
Chief Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
March 4, 2001