

# New York Supreme Court

## Appellate Division—First Department

In the Matter of the Application of

ASHLEY STORINO,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

*(For Continuation of Caption See Inside Cover)*

---

---

### MOTION OF FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF

---

---

DARPANA M. SHETH

*Counsel of Record*

KATLYN PATTON

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN  
EDUCATION

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Foundation  
for Individual Rights in Education*

700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE

Washington, DC 20003

(215) 717-3473

darpana.sheth@thefire.org

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04294**

Index No.  
157947/20

---

In the Matter of the Application of

ELNAZ POURASGARI,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04295**

Index No.  
157815/20

---

In the Matter of the Application of

MARC SANTONOCITO,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

---

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04296**

Index No.  
157787/20

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT

In the Matter of the Application ) Appellate Case No.:  
of ASHLEY STORINO, ) 2020/04294  
)  
*Petitioner-Respondent-* ) NY Cty. Index No.:  
*Appellant,* ) 157947/20  
)  
v. )  
)  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ) NOTICE OF MOTION  
)  
*Respondent-Appellant-* )  
*Respondent.* )

In the Matter of the Application ) Appellate Case No.:  
of ELNAZ POURASGARI, ) 2020/04295  
)  
*Petitioner-Respondent-* ) NY Cty. Index No.:  
*Appellant,* ) 157815/20  
)  
v. )  
)  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ) NOTICE OF MOTION  
)  
*Respondent-Appellant-* )  
*Respondent.* )

In the Matter of the Application	)	Appellate Case No.:
of MARC SANTONOCITO,	)	2020/04296
	)	
<i>Petitioner-Respondent-</i>	)	NY Cty. Index No.:
<i>Appellant,</i>	)	157787/20
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION
	)	
<i>Respondent-Appellant-</i>	)	
<i>Respondent.</i>	)	

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (“FIRE”) will respectfully move, at a term of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, First Judicial Department, at the courthouse located at 27 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10010 on January 4, 2021 at 10:00 A.M., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, for an order pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1250.4(f) and Appellate Division First Department Rule 600.4 granting FIRE leave to file and serve the required number of copies of the attached *amicus curiae* brief in support of Petitioners-Respondents-Appellants in the above-captioned appeals.

In support of this motion, FIRE also submits the attached affirmation of Darpana M. Sheth, Exhibits A, B, and C, and six copies of




the proposed *Amicus Curiae* Brief under Appellate Division First Department Rule 600.4(b).

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that, under Practice Rule of the Appellate Division 1250.4(a)(8) (22 NYCRR 1250.4(a)(8)), oral argument on this motion is neither required nor permitted.

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that, under CPLR 2214(b), an answering affidavit and any notice of cross-motion, with supporting papers must be served at least seven days before this motion is to be heard; any reply or responding affidavits shall be served at least one day before the motion is to be heard.

Dated: December 22, 2020



Darpana M. Sheth  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL  
RIGHTS IN EDUCATION  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE  
Suite 340  
Washington, DC 20003  
(215) 717-3473  
darpana.sheth@thefire.org

TO:

Ira M. Feinberg  
Benjamin A. Fleming  
Andrew M. Harris  
Hogan Lovells US LLP  
390 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel.: (212) 918-3000  
Fax: (212) 918-3100  
ira.feinberg@hoganlovells.com  
benjamin.fleming@hoganlovells.com  
andrew.harris@hoganlovells.com  
*Attorneys for Respondent-Appellant-  
Respondent New York University*

Jacqueline E. Esposito, Esq.  
Karen F. Edler, Esq.  
Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio, P.C.  
4 West Red Oak Lane, Suite 302  
White Plains, NY 10604  
Tel.: (201) 391-3737  
jesposito@pricemeese.com  
kedler@pricemeese.com  
*Attorneys for Petitioners-Respondents-  
Appellants Storino, Santonocito & Pourasgari*

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT

In the Matter of the Application ) Appellate Case No.:  
of ASHLEY STORINO, ) 2020/04294  
)  
*Petitioner-Respondent-* ) NY Cty. Index No.:  
*Appellant,* ) 157947/20  
)  
v. ) AFFIRMATION OF  
) DARPANA M. SHETH IN  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ) SUPPORT OF MOTION OF  
) FOUNDATION FOR  
*Respondent-Appellant-* ) INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN  
*Respondent.* ) EDUCATION TO APPEAR  
) AS *AMICUS CURIAE*

In the Matter of the Application ) Appellate Case No.:  
of ELNAZ POURASGARI, ) 2020/04295  
)  
*Petitioner-Respondent-* ) NY Cty. Index No.:  
*Appellant,* ) 157815/20  
)  
v. ) AFFIRMATION OF  
) DARPANA M. SHETH IN  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ) SUPPORT OF MOTION OF  
) FOUNDATION FOR  
*Respondent-Appellant-* ) INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN  
*Respondent.* ) EDUCATION TO APPEAR  
) AS *AMICUS CURIAE*

In the Matter of the Application of MARC SANTONOCITO,	) Appellate Case No.:
	) 2020/04296
	)
<i>Petitioner-Respondent-</i> <i>Appellant,</i>	) NY Cty. Index No.:
	) 157787/20
	)
v.	) AFFIRMATION OF
	) DARPANA M. SHETH IN
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,	) SUPPORT OF MOTION OF
	) FOUNDATION FOR
<i>Respondent-Appellant-</i> <i>Respondent.</i>	) INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN
	) EDUCATION TO APPEAR
	) AS <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>

I, DARPANA M. SHETH, duly affirm and say:

1. I am an attorney and the Vice President of Litigation for proposed *amicus curiae* Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (“FIRE”) in these appeals.

2. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of New York.

3. I submit this affirmation in support of this application of FIRE for leave to file an *amicus curiae* brief in the above-captioned appeals.

4. I submit this information upon information and belief, based upon my familiarity with the work of FIRE, review of the pleadings and papers in this matter, and discussion with my client.



5. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (“FIRE”) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting and protecting civil liberties at our nation’s institutions of higher education. Since 1999, FIRE has successfully defended the expressive and due-process rights and academic freedom of thousands of students and faculty members across the United States. FIRE defends fundamental rights at both public and private institutions by publicly advocating and litigating on behalf of students and faculty members, and participating as *amicus curiae* in cases that implicate student and faculty rights, like the one now before this Court. For example, last year FIRE filed a brief as *amicus curiae* in support of two students suspended from Louisiana State University’s dental program after the university attempted to exclude them from classes pending its appeal of a loss at the trial court level. *See Thien et al. v. Bd. of Supervisors of La. State Univ. & Agric. & Mech. Coll.*, 271 So. 3d 195 (La. 2019).


6. The students FIRE defends rely on the procedural rights enshrined in the institutional promises, commitments, and policies of private colleges and universities like New York University. Because this appeal concerns NYU’s failure to adhere to its own promises to provide

students with fair disciplinary proceedings, affirmation of the trial court's ruling is critically important to protecting students' rights at institutions of higher education throughout New York and nationwide.

7. FIRE appears for the purpose of providing the court with its unique, experienced, and credible rights-oriented perspective, rather than to duplicate arguments made by the Parties.

8. On behalf of FIRE, I respectfully request that the Court issue an order granting FIRE's motion for leave to file the accompanying brief as *amicus curiae* with respect to these appeals.

Dated: December 22, 2020



Darpana M. Sheth  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL  
RIGHTS IN EDUCATION  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE  
Suite 340  
Washington, DC 20003  
(215) 717-3473  
darpana.sheth@thefire.org

# **Exhibit A**



SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
NEW YORK COUNTY

----- x  
In the Matter of

ASHLEY STORINO,

Petitioner,

NOTICE OF APPEAL

-against-

Index No. 157947/2020

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

Hon. Carol R. Edmead

Respondent.


For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the  
Civil Practice Law and Rules.

----- x  
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Respondent New York University hereby appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Judicial Department, from the annexed Decision and Order on Motion of the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (Hon. Carol R. Edmead, J.S.C.) dated October 21, 2020 and entered in Office of the County Clerk, New York County on October 21, 2020. This appeal is taken from each and every part of said Decision and Order on Motion as well as the whole thereof.

Dated: New York, New York  
October 23, 2020

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Monica Barrett, Esq.  
Louis P. DiLorenzo, Esq.  
Jessica C. Moller, Esq.  
*Attorneys for Respondent*  
600 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
(646) 253-2300



SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
NEW YORK COUNTY

----- x  
In the Matter of

MARC SANTONOCITO,

Petitioner,

NOTICE OF APPEAL

-against-

Index No. 157787/2020

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

Hon. Carol R. Edmead

Respondent.

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the  
Civil Practice Law and Rules.

----- x

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Respondent New York University hereby appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Judicial Department, from the annexed Decision and Order on Motion of the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (Hon. Carol R. Edmead, J.S.C.) dated October 21, 2020 and entered in Office of the County Clerk, New York County on October 21, 2020. This appeal is taken from each and every part of said Decision and Order on Motion as well as the whole thereof.

Dated: New York, New York  
October 23, 2020

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC

By: 

Monica Barrett, Esq.  
Louis P. DiLorenzo, Esq.  
Jessica C. Moller, Esq.  
*Attorneys for Respondent*  
600 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
(646) 253-2300

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
NEW YORK COUNTY

----- x  
In the Matter of

ELNAZ POURASGARI,

Petitioner,

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

-against-

Index No. 157815/2020

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

Hon. Carol R. Edmead

Respondent.

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the  
Civil Practice Law and Rules.

----- x  
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Respondent New York University hereby appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Judicial Department, from the annexed Decision and Order on Motion of the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (Hon. Carol R. Edmead, J.S.C.) dated October 21, 2020 and entered in Office of the County Clerk, New York County on October 21, 2020. This appeal is taken from each and every part of said Decision and Order on Motion as well as the whole thereof.

Dated: New York, New York  
October 23, 2020

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC

By: 

Monica Barrett, Esq.  
Louis P. DiLorenzo, Esq.  
Jessica C. Moller, Esq.  
*Attorneys for Respondent*  
600 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
(646) 253-2300

# **Exhibit B**

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

-----X

In the Matter of the Application of  
Marc Santonocito,  
Petitioner,

**NOTICE OF ENTRY**

For a Judgement Pursuant to Article 78 of the  
Civil Practice Law and Rules

Index No. 157787/2020

-against-

Hon. Carol R. Edmead

New York University,


Respondent.

-----X

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the attached is a true copy of the Decision and Order on Motion (NYSCEF Doc. No. 36) of the New York State Supreme Court, New York County (Hon. Carol R. Edmead, J.S.C.) dated October 21, 2020, which was duly filed and entered in the Office of the County Clerk, New York County on October 21, 2020.

Dated: Westchester, New York  
October 22, 2020

**PRICE, MEESE, SHULMAN & D'ARMINIO, P.C.**

By:   
Jacqueline E. Esposito, Esq.  
Karen F. Edler, Esq.  
*Attorneys for Petitioner*  
West Red Oak Lane, Suite 302  
White Plains, New York 10604  
(201) 391-3737

TO: Monica C. Barrett, Esq.  
Louis P. DiLorenzo, Esq.  
Jessica C. Moller, Esq.  
**BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC**  
*Attorneys for the Respondent*  
600 Third Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
(646) 253-2300



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

PRESENT: HON. CAROL R. EDMEAD PART IAS MOTION 35EFM

*Justice*

-----X

MARC SANTONOCITO

Plaintiff,

- v -

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

Defendant.

-----X

INDEX NO. 157787/2020

MOTION DATE 10/15/2020

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001

**DECISION + ORDER ON  
MOTION**

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 12, 16, 17, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34

were read on this motion to/for ARTICLE 78 (BODY OR OFFICER).

Upon the foregoing documents, it is

ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECLARED that the petitions for relief, pursuant to CPLR Article 78, of petitioners Marc Santonocito, Elnaz Pourasgari, and Ashley Storino (Index Nos. 157787/2020, 157815/2020 and 157947/2020, motion sequence number 001) are granted; to wit:

- (i) It is declared that the separate Decisions made by Respondent New York University ("Respondent" or "NYU") to suspend Petitioners Marc Santonocito, Elnaz Pourasgari, and Ashley Storino (collectively, "Petitioners") for the fall 2020 semester are arbitrary, capricious and constitute an abuse of discretion;
- (ii) the Decisions are annulled, voided and vacated;
- (iii) Respondent is directed to remove the disciplinary suspension from each of Petitioners' official student records;
- (iv) Respondent shall allow Petitioners to immediately return to their fall 2020 classes and receive extensions of time to complete work missed as a result of the Decisions; and it is further

ORDERED that Petitioners' application for attorneys' fees is denied; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly; and it is further

ORDERED that counsel for Petitioners shall serve a copy of this order along with notice of entry within twenty (20) days.



## MEMORANDUM DECISION

In this Article 78 proceeding, three petitions (Index Nos. 157787/2020, 157815/2020 and 157947/2020) are consolidated for disposition.

The three petitions seek an order (i) declaring the separate Decisions (*infra*, at p. 6) made by Respondent New York University (“Respondent” or “NYU”) to suspend Petitioners Marc Santonocito (“Santonocito”), Elnaz Pourasgari (“Pourasgari”) and Ashley Storino (“Storino”) (collectively, “Petitioners”) for the fall 2020 semester to be arbitrary, capricious and constituting an abuse of discretion; (ii) annulling, voiding and vacating the Decisions; (iii) directing Respondent to remove the disciplinary suspension from each of Petitioners’ official student records; (iv) allowing Petitioners to immediately return to their fall 2020 classes and receive extensions of time to complete work missed as a result of the Decisions; and (v) awarding Petitioners attorneys’ fees, costs and filing fees<sup>1</sup>. The three petitions are consolidated for disposition<sup>2</sup>.

Simultaneous to the filing of their petitions, Petitioners moved, by Order to Show Cause (“OSC”), for issuance of a temporary restraining order staying the Decisions, and all the sanctions imposed therein, pending a hearing. On September 25, 2020, the Court heard the OSC applications of Santonocito and Pourasgari and granted the same to the extent of allowing Santonocito and

---

<sup>1</sup> In their Notice of Motion, Petitioners seek attorneys’ fees. However, Petitioners’ submissions do not address attorneys’ fees and in Respondent’s opposition papers, attorneys’ fees are likewise not addressed. As such, the Court deems this prayer for relief abandoned and it is thus denied.

<sup>2</sup> While Petitioners were disciplined separately and brought separate Article 78 applications before this Court, the factual circumstances are virtually identical for all Petitioners and they are represented by the same counsel. At a teleconference before the Court held October 15, 2020, counsel for Petitioners agreed that the Court would resolve all petitions globally via written decision.



Pourasgari to continue attending their fall 2020 virtual classes until their petitions are decided on the merits<sup>3</sup>. The OSC application of Storino was heard and granted on October 15, 2020<sup>4</sup>.

Respondent opposes all three petitions and moves for their dismissal in their entirety.

## BACKGROUND

### The Petitioners

*Marc Santonocito (Index No. 157787/2020)*

Petitioner Santonocito is currently enrolled for academic year 2020-2021 at the NYU School of Professional Studies (NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Santonocito, ¶ 2). He is a sophomore majoring in Sports Management (*Id.*). He resides in an apartment off-campus which he shares with three other NYU students (NYSCEF doc No. 1, ¶ 4).

On August 12, 2020, Santonocito “hosted a small gathering of approximately 12-13 friends...at [his] private apartment” (NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Santonocito, ¶ 14). He claims that “although [he] was present in the apartment, [he was] social distancing” (*Id.*).

On August 14, 2020, Santonocito attended a small gathering of approximately 10-12 friends “at an outdoor, private rooftop connected to a private apartment” (*Id.*, ¶ 16). He claims that “he walked to and from this small gathering with a mask on” (*Id.*).

On August 20, 2020, Santonocito took a COVID-19 test and the test results released on August 21, 2020 showed that he was negative for COVID-19 (*Id.*, ¶¶ 20-21).

On August 25, 2020, Santonocito received an email from NYU’s Office of Student Conduct (“OSC”) informing him that the NYU OSC was in receipt of an incident report alleging

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Order dated September 25, 2020, this Court granted the OSC applications of Santonocito and Pourasgari on the conditions that, pending a hearing: (i) “[a]ttending virtual classes is the only activity that Petitioner[s] [are] allowed to engage in at Respondent’s campuses and/or premises”; (ii) Petitioners shall “observe conduct in accordance with Federal, State, City and CDC guidelines relating to COVID-19”; and (iii) Petitioners shall “observe and comply with all directives, guidelines and rules from Respondent other than those at issue in this proceeding.”

<sup>4</sup> As counsel for Petitioners agreed that the Court would resolve all petitions globally, it is understood that the OSC application of Storino was granted subject to the same conditions set forth in the Court’s September 25, 2020 Order.



that Santonocito “attended a large gathering at an off-campus location without proper use of masks and social distancing” and that, consequently, Santonocito was being charged with potentially violating university policies related to the COVID-19 pandemic (NYSCEF doc No. 4 at 22).

*Elnaz Pourasgari (Index No. 157815/2020)*

Petitioner Pourasgari is currently enrolled for academic year 2020-2021 at the NYU College of Arts and Sciences (NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Pourasgari, ¶ 2). She is a junior majoring in Biology (*Id.*). She resides in an apartment off-campus which she shares with four other NYU students (NYSCEF doc No. 1, ¶ 4). The apartment allegedly has a “private rooftop” (*Id.*, ¶ 9).

On August 19, 2020, Pourasgari was tested for COVID-19 and on August 20, 2020, she received the results indicating that she was negative for COVID-19 (*Id.*, ¶¶ 16-17).

On August 22, 2020, Pourasgari attended “a small gathering of less than 15 people “at a friend’s off-campus, private, rooftop” (*Id.*, ¶ 18). She claims that she “walked to and from this small gathering with [her] suitemate, and [they] wore masks” (*Id.*, ¶ 20). Furthermore, according to Pourasgari, “[she] did take the mask off in the presence of [her] suitemate at this small private gathering given that [she] was on private property, with [her] suitemate and others in [her] social bubble, [they] were outside, and [they] were maintaining social distances from those outside [their] social bubble” (*Id.*).

On August 25, 2020, Pourasgari received an email from NYU OSC informing her that the office was in receipt of an incident report alleging that Pourasgari “attended a large gathering at an off-campus location without proper use of masks and social distancing” and, consequently, she was being charged with potentially violating university policies (NYSCEF doc No. 4 at 21).



*Ashley Storino (Index No. 157947/2020)*

Petitioner Storino is currently enrolled for academic year 2020-2021 at the NYU Stern School of Business. She resides in an apartment off-campus which she shares with three other NYU students (NYSCEF doc No. 1, ¶ 4). Storino's apartment allegedly has a "private outdoor rooftop" (*Id.*).

On August 12, 2020, Storino "attended a small gathering of approximately 12-13 friends...at a private, off campus apartment" (NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Storino, ¶ 14). She claims that she "walked to and from this small gathering with a mask on" (*Id.*).

On August 14, 2020, Storino "hosted a small gathering of approximately 10-12 friends...at [her] outdoor, private rooftop connected to [her] private apartment" (*Id.*, ¶ 17).

On August 19, 2020, Storino took a COVID-19 test and the test results showed that she was negative for COVID-19 (*Id.*, ¶¶ 20-21).

On August 25, 2020, Storino received an email from NYU OSC informing her that the office was in receipt of an incident report alleging that Storino "attended a large gathering at an off-campus location without proper use of masks and social distancing" and, consequently, she was being charged with potentially violating University Policies (NYSCEF doc No. 4, at 20).

All Petitioners herein claim that they are members of the NYU Track and Field team (the "Track and Field Team") (NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Santonocito, ¶ 4; NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Pourasgari, ¶ 5; NYSCEF doc No. 4, Affidavit of Storino, ¶ 6). Their counsel further alleges that that is "how they came to be in [their social] bubble." (Transcript at 38:19-22 ["This is a group – a social bubble – deliberately formed by a group of students who are track and field athletes. That's how they came to be in the bubble and how they came to be friends."])

### The Disciplinary Charges Against Petitioners<sup>5</sup>

Petitioners were all requested to attend a Conduct Conference via Zoom (“Conduct Conference”) at different times on August 26, 2020 to discuss the incidents involving them and were further warned that Respondent would consider sanctions, including their suspension from NYU. The Conduct Conferences proceeded as scheduled on August 26, 2020.

On August 27, 2020, each of the Petitioners received a letter from Respondent (collectively, the “Decisions”) setting forth Respondent’s finding that Petitioners violated sections B1 and E1 of the NYU Student Conduct Policy (the “Student Conduct Policy”). Sections B1 and E1 of the Student Conduct Policy, which the Decisions against Petitioners cite as grounds for the disciplinary action, both prohibit students from engaging in conduct that poses a danger to the health, safety or welfare of the NYU community. Prohibited conduct under sections B1 and E1 is described as follows:

“University Student Conduct Policy/B1: Engaging in or threatening to engage in behavior(s) that, by virtue of their intensity, repetitiveness, or otherwise, endanger or compromise the health, safety or well-being of oneself, another person, or the general University community.”

“University Student Conduct Policy/E1: Disorderly, disruptive, or antagonizing behavior that interferes with the safety, security, health or welfare of the community, and/or the regular operation of the University.”

---

<sup>5</sup> The remainder of the citations in this memorandum decision will refer to documents under Index No. 157787/2020 unless otherwise noted.



To support the Decisions, Respondent referenced alleged admissions made by Petitioners during the Conduct Conferences wherein Petitioners admitted to attending gatherings without wearing masks and observing social distancing.<sup>678</sup>

The Decisions imposed the following sanctions:

- (i) Suspension from NYU for the fall 2020 semester until December 31, 2020 with eligibility to resume course of studies in the January 2021 term;
- (ii) Probation upon return to NYU until August 31, 2021; and
- (iii) Submission of a research and reflection paper focusing on the role young people have played in the transmission of COVID-19 in the United States due on October 1, 2020.

On September 2, 2020, Petitioners separately appealed the Decisions on grounds that: (i) a material procedural error occurred as neither section B1 nor section E1 advise anyone that failing to wear a mask or to socially distance in an off-campus private residence constitutes an action prohibited under these policies (NYSCEF doc No. 4, p. 2-4); (ii) that relevant evidence, such as the fact that they tested negative for COVID-19 after the reported incidents,<sup>9</sup> was not considered (*Id.*, pp. 4-6); and (iii) that the sanctions imposed are substantially disproportionate to the offense charged (*Id.*, pp. 6-8).

---

<sup>6</sup> In the letter to Santonocito, Respondent stated that “[d]uring [the zoom] conversation, [Santonocito] stated that [he] attended two social gatherings where [he] did not wear a mask or properly social distance [and] this was confirmed through the photos that were posted on social media.”

<sup>7</sup> In the letter to Pourasgari, Respondent stated that “[d]uring [the zoom] conversation, [Pourasgari] stated that [she] attended one social gathering where [she] did not wear a mask or properly social distance [and] this was confirmed through the photos that were posted on social media.”

<sup>8</sup> In the letter to Storino, Respondent stated that “[d]uring [the zoom] conversation, [Storino] stated that [she] attended two social gatherings where [she] did not wear a mask or properly social distance [and] this was confirmed through the photos that were posted on social media.”

<sup>9</sup> This is not the case for Pourasgari, who took the test prior to the reported incident.



On September 11, 2020, Respondent denied Petitioners' respective appeals as they allegedly failed to raise procedural errors that could be grounds for appeal. Respondent also maintained that Petitioners were disciplined under applicable policy provisions as "[section] B1 and E1 clearly state that it is a violation to engage in behavior that either endangers, compromises, or interferes with the health and safety of the University community." Finally, Respondent upheld the sanctions it imposed, asserting that the severity of Petitioners' misconduct warranted the same.

Petitioners then separately commenced the Article 78 proceedings before this Court, arguing that Respondent's Determinations against each of them violate NYU's policies and procedures, are fundamentally unfair, arbitrary and capricious, and constitute an abuse of discretion (NYSCEF doc No. 1, ¶ 1).

## DISCUSSION

### *Notice*

Petitioners argue as a preliminary matter that Respondent "provided no notice to Petitioner[s], or the NYU community at large, that Petitioner[s] were subject to discipline, let alone suspension for the semester, for failing to wear a face mask and socially distance outside on the private, off-campus rooftop of a private residence during summer break with members of [Petitioners'] social bubble." (Index No. 157815, NYCSEF doc No. 14, p. 12) They further argue that "[n]owhere in the COVID Policy or [Student] Conduct Policy does it inform NYU students that engaging in this type of conduct, outside on the rooftop of a private residence, with a limited number of people, during summer break before stepping foot on campus, and in conjunction with following all applicable state, city, and additional health guidelines, could possibly result in sanctions..." (*Id.*). While Petitioners do not explicitly raise the issue of "pre-conduct notice" in their papers, the gist of Petitioners' argument is that at no point did Respondent provide advance



notice that their off-campus conduct during summer break would subject them to sanctions. The Court thus must address notice before turning to the other legal matters at issue in this proceeding.

To assess whether Petitioners were afforded sufficient pre-conduct notice, the Court evaluates each communication that was sent by Respondent to Petitioners prior to when they engaged in the alleged misconduct in early August.

### *Pre-Conduct Notice*

#### *The July 30, 2020 Notice from Marc Wais to NYU Students*

This written communication, entitled “NYU Returns: IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION – COVID-19 Testing, Quarantining, and Early Arrival Procedures for Fall 2020-2021,” (the “July 30 Notice”) was emailed to all students on July 30, 2020 by Marc Wais, the Senior Vice President for Student Affairs (NYSCEF doc No. 31, Exhibit A). As the title indicates, the contents of this notice are clearly directed to the coming academic year and pertain to conduct within the academic year taking place on NYU’s campus. The Court cites to the following relevant provisions of the July 30 Notice to demonstrate that it is clearly limited in scope:

- “*Key Takeaways*: Students from the tri-state area must be tested and submit the results no more than 14 days before they plan to first enter any NYU academic or administrative building.”
- “*Introduction*: All students coming from or having spent time in the 14 days prior to departure in states designated by NY State (in conjunction with NJ and CT) as “restricted” or coming from international points of departure must arrive on August 18-19 and must quarantine in New York for two weeks before entering any NYU academic or administrative buildings.”
- “*Quarantining and Early Arrival*: The 14-day quarantine must, by law, be completed before students attend any inperson classes or enter NYU academic or administrative facilities.”
- “*Quarantining for Students who Do Not Live in NYU Housing*: We recommend that students arrive by August 18-19 so that they can fully participate in campus



activities, including in-person classes, on the first day of the semester. Students will be required to attest that they completed the mandatory 14-day quarantine — as well as submit a negative COVID-19 test — before coming to campus.”

- “*Compliance with Safety and Health Rules:* The University plans to strictly enforce the new safety and health rules we are putting in place for academic year 2020-2021 . . . . To have a successful semester, we must all strictly abide by the new COVID-19 health and safety protocols — wearing a mask, keeping social distance, handwashing, not coming to class if you feel sick, being tested, etc.”
- “*Conclusion:* In advance of and over the course of fall 2020, everyone will be tested at least once. Many will be tested two or more times. Our goals — to safely reassemble on campus for the fall, to prevent the spread of COVID-19, and to keep each other safe as we fulfill our academic mission — greatly rely on a strong testing program, such as this.”

A comprehensive reading of the July 30 Notice thus provides that this document did not give pre-conduct notice that a rooftop private gathering over the summer break could result in sanctions including suspension. The Court further notes that Respondent’s stated policy of testing each student for COVID-19 “in advance of” the fall semester can be implied as a tacit acknowledgement that Respondent’s guidelines do not encompass the types of conduct students may or may not have engaged in over their summer break.

*The July 30, 2020 Notice from President Andrew Hamilton*

This written communication, entitled “A Letter to Parents from NYU President Andrew Hamilton,” (the “Letter to Parents”) was emailed to all parents and guardians of students on July 30, 2020 by Andrew Hamilton, the University President (NYSCEF doc No. 31, Exhibit B). The Court cites to the following relevant provisions of the Letter to Parents to demonstrate that it is clearly limited in scope to the forthcoming academic year and pertains to conduct within the academic year taking place on NYU’s campus:

- “All of us at NYU are looking forward to welcoming your student for the fall semester, whether in person here in New York, participating in “Go Local” at an NYU global site, or studying remotely.”



- “We have done a great deal of planning and work to make the University safer for those who are returning to campus. As we look ahead to the coming academic year, we know the risk from COVID19 cannot be eliminated; however, with conscientious adherence to the safety and health protocols NYU has put in place — particularly mask wearing, physical distancing, and avoiding large gatherings — we believe it can be managed effectively.”
- “We will be communicating the necessity of following our new health rules repeatedly and extensively to everyone on campus.”
- “Throughout higher education, there is concern about students' willingness to abide strictly by new health rules on campus.”
- “Accordingly, the new safety rules will form part of required student conduct throughout the semester. Breaches will be treated seriously and referred to the student disciplinary process; egregious or repeated cases could result in serious sanctions, including but not limited to suspension.”

A comprehensive reading of the Letter to Parents thus provides that this document did not give pre-conduct notice that a rooftop private gathering over the summer break could result in sanctions including suspension. While the last cited provision makes clear that students may be subject to serious discipline for conduct violations, the potential sanctions are explicitly limited to conduct occurring during the semester.

*The August 5, 2020 COVID Policy*

Respondent issued its “Policy on Requirements Related to Access to NYU Buildings and Campus Grounds Resulting from the COVID-19 Pandemic” (the “COVID Policy”) effective August 5, 2020 (NYSCEF doc No. 6). The Court cites to the following relevant provisions of the COVID Policy to demonstrate that it is clearly limited in scope to the forthcoming academic year and pertains to conduct within the academic year taking place on NYU’s campus:

- “In accordance with these principles, this Policy sets forth requirements for Members of the NYU Community, which, for purposes of this Policy, includes faculty, staff, students, Vendors, and Visitors, entering NYU Buildings and while on Campus Grounds during the COVID-19 pandemic.”



- “To Whom This Policy Applies: This Policy applies to all Members of the NYU Community who may be in NYU Buildings and on Campus Grounds in New York.”
- “All Members of the NYU Community are required to wear face coverings at all times while in NYU Buildings and on Campus Grounds.”
- “While in NYU Buildings, all Members of the NYU Community are expected to maintain a distance of at least six feet from others to the greatest extent possible (except as may be required for safety reasons or for the core activity, e.g., moving equipment), including when entering NYU Buildings, while transiting through them, and in work spaces. All non-essential gatherings of any type should be avoided.”
- “Campus Grounds means any space outside of NYU Buildings which is used by NYU, including but not limited to, plazas, walkways, and loading docks.”

A comprehensive reading of the COVID Policy thus provides that this document did not give pre-conduct notice that a rooftop private gathering over the summer break could result in sanctions including suspension. The policy bans gatherings, but only those in NYU buildings, and the definition of “Campus Grounds” specifically precludes private residences.

*The August 14, 2020 Written Communication and Video from Craig Jolley*

On August 14, 2020, a follow-up written communication entitled “Your Action Required: Community Standards in the Context of COVID-19” (the “August 14 Notice”) was e-mailed to all students by Craig Jolley, Director of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (NYSCEF doc No. 31, Exhibits C and D). The August 14 Notice set forth additional conduct requirements for the academic year and required students to watch a video about the COVID-19 safety measures, and to sign an affidavit stating that they viewed the video and acknowledged the policies no later than August 24, 2020. The Court cites to the following relevant provisions of the



August 14 Notice and its accompanying video to demonstrate that the materials are clearly limited in scope to the forthcoming academic year:

- “As stated in our July 30th communication, the University plans to strictly enforce our safety and health rules we are putting in place for *academic year 2020-2021*.” (emphasis added)
- “[A]ll students enrolled for the Fall 2020 semester must complete the following three tasks, regardless of whether you will be on campus, in person or remote.”
- “The NYU Rules of Gatherings should be applied when you’re off-campus as well. Bars and parties should be avoided<sup>10</sup> because of their well-documented role in spreading the Coronavirus.”
- “Students may face disciplinary action including restriction from campus buildings, removal from the residence halls, and possibly even suspension and de-enrollment, through the Office of Student Conduct.”

Unlike the earlier written communications, the August 14 Notice and video clearly provide notice that off-campus gatherings such as those at issue here may be subject to sanctions. As August 14 was the first date that off-campus gatherings were mentioned, it is undisputed that when Petitioner Santonocito hosted a social gathering on August 12, 2020, he had no prior notice that such act could result in imposition of sanctions by Respondent. Santonocito viewed the complete video on the morning of August 14, 2020 and submitted his affidavit at 11:05 a.m. on that day (NYSCEF doc No. 31, p. 5). Of course, when Santonocito attended another social gathering on the evening of August 14, he had already viewed the video and submitted his affidavit. As to Petitioners Pourasgari and Storino, the record shows that neither of them had any prior notice that attending a private gathering off campus could result in imposition of sanctions, as they both viewed the video and submitted their affidavits after the reported incidents, on August 28 and 26, respectively (Counsel for Petitioners’ email to the Court dated October 16, 2020).

---

<sup>10</sup> “Should be avoided” is a recommendation, not a directive. The Cambridge Dictionary defines “should” as “used to say or ask what is the correct or best thing to do.”



However, the Court notes that regardless of whether Petitioners viewed these materials and signed their affidavits before or after attending their social gatherings, Petitioners were still not under pre-conduct notice *for the specific social gatherings they attended in early August*. Critically, nothing in the August 14 Notice and video suggest that the enforcements described therein take effect immediately. The communications specifically note that Respondent plans to enforce these rules during the upcoming semester and throughout the academic year but make no reference to their enforcement during the Summer 2020 break. Therefore, as soon as Petitioners viewed the video, and signed the affidavits, they were on notice that the type of conduct they engaged in could subject them to sanctions *them during the academic year*, but Petitioners were afforded no notice that engaging in the same conduct in early August, prior to the start of the semester, would subject them to potential discipline.

The Court additionally notes that on September 3, 2020, after taking disciplinary action against Petitioners, Respondent issued another written communication to all students entitled “Keeping Each Other Safe: Additional Guidance on University Expectations” to the NYU community (the “Additional Guidelines”) (NYSCEF doc No. 8). The Additional Guidelines expanded the ban on gatherings to off-campus locations, noting that students are expected to “*stay away from gatherings where there are no masks or distancing, even at off-campus private residences.*” *Id.* (emphasis in original). The Additional Guidelines explicitly state that attending a gathering where masks and distancing are not enforced “will likely” result in suspension (*Id.*). Respondent’s decision to issue the Additional Guidelines on September 3 can be read as an acknowledgment that its earlier communications did not sufficiently advise students that off-campus gatherings would subject students to discipline.



Notwithstanding the fact that pre-conduct notice is lacking here, the Court wishes to impress that care and safety during COVID-19 is critical and must be regulated. However, regulations of student behavior during these unprecedented times must still be conducted in a fair manner. The Court acknowledges care that must be taken to avoid potential “super spreader” events, but the precautions must still be done in a manner that affords *notice* to students of the specific types of conduct prohibited.

Furthermore, “suspension,” the sanction imposed on Petitioners here, is such an indelible, pejorative sanction that it should only be ratified when clear, unambiguous and full pre-conduct notice is given. This sanction would plague a student throughout his/her academic life, and possibly his/her entire career.

In summary, the Court finds that the requisite pre-conduct notice from Respondent to Petitioners was not achieved, and the relief sought by Petitioners should be granted on the issue of pre-conduct notice alone.

#### ***Post-Conduct Notice***

Petitioners contend that they were also not afforded post-conduct notice as Respondent failed to provide “[w]ritten notice . . . detailing the date and location of the incident, nature of alleged conduct, and applicable policies alleged to have been violated” pursuant to Respondent’s Student Conduct Policy (NYSCEF doc No. 14 at 7). As the specific dates and locations of the gatherings were not referenced, the Decisions were not “based on a preponderance of the evidence” as required by the Student Conduct Policy (*Id.*).

However, on August 25, 2020, Petitioners were each specifically informed, in writing, that Respondent had received an incident report regarding their alleged attendance at an off-campus gathering without proper use of masks and social distancing (NYSCEF doc No. 32, ¶ 7,



Ex. A). While Petitioners are correct that the specific time and location of the subject gatherings were not provided in the initial letters sent to them, Petitioners admitted to attending the gatherings and not wearing a face covering or social distancing at the time the photos were taken, and Petitioners were further provided with a fair opportunity to, and did, defend themselves against the charges alleged both during the Conduct Conference and thereafter on appeal. The photographic proof provided to Respondent confirmed Petitioners' attendance at the off-campus gatherings and demonstrated that neither masks nor social distancing was observed.

Petitioners thus were all afforded post-conduct notice of the offensive conduct and potential sanctions.

However, as addressed *supra*, given the harsh sanction involved here, the Court finds that Respondent owed Petitioners concise advance notice that the particular conduct they engaged in, at the time they engaged in it, was violative of a specific provision of the Student Conduct Policy. Regardless of the Court's assessment of whether it was prudent of Petitioners to engage in the conduct at issue, a party cannot be penalized with such a harsh sanction as suspension without clear, concise, and full advance notice.

Notwithstanding the Court's conclusion that the relief sought by Petitioners should be granted on the issue of pre-conduct notice alone, assuming *arguendo* that Petitioners were afforded sufficient notice, the Court addresses the remaining issues in this proceeding.

### ***Standard of Review***

The Court's role in an Article 78 proceeding is normally to determine, upon the facts before an administrative body, whether a challenged administrative body determination had a "rational basis" in the record or was "arbitrary and capricious." *See Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester*



*County*, 34 NY2d 222 (1974); *Matter of E.G.A. Assoc. v New York State Div. of Hous. & Community Renewal*, 232 AD2d 302 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 1996). An administrative decision will only be found “arbitrary and capricious” if it is “without sound basis in reason, and in disregard of the facts.” See *Matter of Century Operating Corp. v Popolizio*, 60 NY2d 483, 488 (1983); citing *Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County*, 34 NY2d at 231. Conversely, if there is a “rational basis” for the administrative body’s determination, there can be no judicial interference. *Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County*, 34 NY2d at 231-232.

However, this case does not involve review of a typical “administrative body determination.” Instead, Petitioners have requested the Court to review Respondent’s disciplinary rulings against them. “Courts have a ‘restricted role’ in reviewing determinations of colleges and universities.” *Powers v St. John’s Univ. Sch. of Law*, 25 N.Y.3d 210, 216 (2015). Under well-settled law, determinations made by professional educators with regard to students are entitled to great deference and not generally subject to judicial review. See *Susan M. v New York Law Sch.*, 76 N.Y.2d 241 (1990); *Olsson v Bd. of Higher Educ. of the City of New York*, 49 N.Y.2d 408 (1980); *Tedeschi v Wagner Coll.*, 49 N.Y.2d 652 (1980). Accordingly, the Appellate Division, First Department, has held that “[i]t is well established that judicial review of an educational institution’s disciplinary determination involving nonacademic matters is limited to whether the institution substantially adhered to its own published rules and guidelines and was not arbitrary and capricious.” *Matter of Quercia v New York Univ.*, 41 AD3d 295, 296 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2007), citing *Matter of Harris v Trustees of Columbia Univ.*, 98 AD2d 58, 70 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 1983) (Kassal, J., dissenting), *revd on dissenting op* 62 NY2d 956, (1984); see also *Matter of Acevedo*



*v Preston High Sch.*, 118 AD3d 576 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2014); *Kickertz v New York Univ.*, 110 AD3d 268 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2013); *Matter of Constantine v Teachers Coll.*, 85 AD3d 548 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2011); *Matter of Ebert v Yeshiva Univ.*, 28 AD3d 315 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2006); *Matter of Fernandez v Columbia Univ.*, 16 AD3d 227 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2005).

Therefore, the Court shall apply this standard of review to the present proceeding.

#### *Fundamental Fairness*

As a preliminary matter, the Court notes that as NYU is a private university, Petitioners' argument that Respondent "committed fundamental fairness violations" (NYSCEF doc No. 14 at 7) is misplaced. As the Appellate Division has stated, the "relationship [of a private university] with its students "is essentially a private one such that, absent some showing of State involvement, [its] disciplinary proceedings do not implicate the 'full panoply of due process guarantees.'" (*Doe v Skidmore Coll.*, 152 AD3d 932, 934-35 (3d Dep't 2017); accord *Ebert v Yeshiva Univ.*, 28 AD3d 315, 315 (1st Dep't 2006) ("The 'fundamental fairness' promised by this private university's disciplinary rules is circumscribed by the informal processes and limitations described therein, and was not intended to afford petitioner the full panoply of due process rights").

However, the Court notes that notwithstanding the fact that Respondent is a private university and Petitioners are not entitled to the full extensions of due process, they were nevertheless owed full, advance notice that their conduct would subject them to potential sanctions.

The next question before the Court is whether Respondent "substantially adhered" to its procedural and substantive student disciplinary rules cited. For the following reasons, the court finds that Respondent substantially adhered.



### *Substantial Adherence*

As discussed *supra*, the evidentiary record reflects that Petitioners were afforded post-conduct notice as the charges against them were adjudicated by Respondent in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section III, Forums for Resolution, of the Student Conduct Procedures (NYSCEF doc No. 33, ¶ 28, Ex. G at p. 3-5). As required therein, Petitioners were provided with written notice of the charges against them by email and advised that a remote “Conduct Conference” was scheduled to be held via Zoom the following day (*Id.*, ¶ 28). The Conduct Conferences were subsequently held with each Petitioner, as scheduled, in accordance with Section III(B) of the Student Conduct Procedures. During the Conduct Conferences, Petitioners admitted they attended the gathering(s) in question and neither wore a face mask nor maintained social distance from others while at the gatherings (NYSCEF doc No. 32, ¶ 8).

Petitioners’ conduct in this regard was confirmed in photographic evidence provided to Respondent (*Id.* ¶ 9, Ex. B). The photographs posted on social media show Petitioners standing near other individuals at rooftop parties, without wearing any sort of face covering (*Id.*, Ex. C). As Respondent determined that a violation of the Student Conduct Policy was found to have occurred, Respondent: (i) suspended Petitioners for the Fall 2020 semester, (ii) placed Petitioners on disciplinary probation for the 2020-2021 academic term, and (iii) required Petitioners to write a short research and reflection paper relating to COVID-19 (*Id.*, ¶ 11, Ex. D). All such sanctions are authorized by the Student Conduct Procedures (NYSCEF doc No. 33, ¶ 24, Ex. G at 5). Petitioners were provided Respondent’s determination and the sanctions imposed, in writing, within 10 days of the Conduct Conference, as required by Section III(B) of the Student Conduct Procedures (*Id.*, ¶ 33, Exs. G, K).



As discussed, Petitioners argue that Respondent failed to substantially comply with its own procedures as it failed to provide them with written notice of the “date and location of the incident” upon which the charges were based as required by the Student Conduct Procedures (NYSCEF doc No. 14 at 6-7). As this Court has already concluded, while Petitioners are correct that the specific time and location of the subject gatherings were not provided in the initial letters sent to them, Petitioners still admitted to the conduct with which they were charged. Petitioners are also correct that Respondent’s policies permit a further investigation following the initial disciplinary charges, and Respondent here did not conduct a further investigation (NYSCEF doc No. 1, ¶ 77). However, there is nothing in the Student Conduct Procedures that requires a further investigation. The procedures merely state that Respondent “may conduct such additional investigation as they deem appropriate” (NYSCEF doc No. 33, Ex. G at III(B)). Furthermore, “perfect adherence to every procedural requirement is not necessary to demonstrate substantial compliance” (*Doe*, 152 AD3d at 935).

The Court therefore finds that Respondent “substantially adhered” to the student disciplinary procedures set forth in its Student Conduct Procedures.

#### *Arbitrary and Capricious*

The Court’s next inquiry is to determine whether Respondent’s disciplinary determinations regarding a nonacademic matter “were not arbitrary and capricious.” (*Matter of Quercia v New York Univ.*, 41 AD3d at 296). In this regard, a determination will only be considered “arbitrary and capricious” if it is “without sound basis in reason, and in disregard of the facts,” but not if there is a “rational basis” in the record for the determination. (*Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck*,



*Westchester County*, 34 NY2d at 231-232). Here, the challenged determination is set forth in the portion of the Decisions sent to each Petitioner that stated as follows:

“Considering the importance of creating a safe environment during a global pandemic, the University will not tolerate conduct which intentionally and recklessly disregards the rules and threatens the health and safety of others. Your behavior in this situation is unacceptable and in violation of the NYU Student Conduct Policy, specifically:

*University Student Conduct Policy/B1. Engaging in or threatening to engage in behavior(s) that, by virtue of their intensity, repetitiveness, or otherwise, endanger or compromise the health, safety or well-being of oneself, another person, or the general University community...,*

*University Student Conduct Policy/E1. Disorderly, disruptive, or antagonizing behavior that interferes with the safety, security, health or welfare of the community, and/or the regular operation of the University.”*

(NYSCEF doc No. 2).

Petitioners argue that neither B1 nor E1 “remotely advises them, or anyone in the NYU community, that failing to wear masks or socially distance” constitute acts punishable under these policies. According to Petitioners, B1 is intended to proscribe bullying, threatening, or abusive behavior while E1 is intended to proscribe disorderly conduct. Thus, Petitioners maintain that it was irrational and capricious for NYU to rely on these policies to discipline them for any misconduct related to COVID-19.

Respondent argues that B1 and E1 prohibit a broad range of conduct that poses a risk to or otherwise implicates the health and safety of the NYU community. Although these policies provide examples of prohibited conduct, Respondent maintains that “such examples are just that— illustrative, non-exhaustive examples—as both sections B1 and E1 explicitly state that conduct prohibited by those sections ‘includes but is not limited to’ the examples given”

(NYSCEF doc No. 33, ¶ 21).



The Court concludes that had Respondent afforded Petitioners sufficient pre-conduct notice, sections B1 and E1 would have provided a rational basis for discipline, as the Court cannot second guess the scope of policies that may properly fall within the purview of the educational institution which issued and implements them. The Court notes that while attending a private gathering would not, in normal times, be considered disruptive behavior, in the midst of a deadly global pandemic, attending a social gathering without proper safety protocols in place could certainly be deemed behavior that has the potential to endanger “the safety, security, health or welfare of the community.” Furthermore, as discussed *supra*, Petitioners were required to submit electronic affidavits stating that they read and agreed to abide by the Student Conduct Policy – which contains sections B1 and E1 – to support the health and safety of oneself and others within the NYU community. In fact, Petitioners themselves admitted in this proceeding that section “E1 is intended to proscribe disorderly conduct, which can include a failure to abide by the COVID Policy or any related governmental orders issues concerning public health” (NYSCEF doc No. 14, p. 5). Additionally, the Student Conduct Policy provides that “the University may take disciplinary action for conduct occurring outside the University context which substantially disrupts the regular operation of the University or threatens the health, safety, or security of the University community” (NYSCEF doc No. 5, p. 6). Thus, it would have been rational for Respondent to rely on applicable provisions under the Student Conduct Policy had Petitioners been afforded pre-conduct notice.

In sum, the Court finds Petitioners’ opposition arguments on this specific matter to be unpersuasive and reiterates the finding that Respondent’s disciplinary decision would have satisfied the hybrid “substantial adherence/arbitrary and capricious” standard of review, had Respondent afforded Petitioners sufficient pre-conduct notice.



The final issue to be addressed is whether the sanctions imposed by Respondent were “so disproportionate to the offense, in the light of all the circumstances, as to be shocking to one’s sense of fairness.” *Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County*, 34 NY2d at 233, citing *Matter of Stolz v Board of Regents*, 4 AD2d 361, 364 (3d Dept 1957).

*Shocking the Conscience*

In evaluating the appropriateness of nonacademic discipline, such as that imposed here, the Court is limited to evaluating whether the penalty imposed is so disproportionate to the offense as to be shocking to one’s sense of fairness. *Powers v St. John’s Univ. Sch. Of Law*, 25 NY3d (2015); *Beilis v Albany Medical Coll. of Union Univ.*, 136 AD2d 42, 45 (3d Dept 1988). A result is shocking to one’s sense of fairness if the sanction imposed is so grave in its impact on the individual subjected to it that it is disproportionate to the misconduct, incompetence, failure or turpitude of the individual, or to the harm or risk of harm to the agency or institution, or to the public generally visited or threatened by the derelictions of the individuals.” *Pell*, 34 N.Y.2d 222, 234 [1972]). “The Court is not allowed to simply substitute its judgment as to the appropriate measure of punishment for that determined appropriate by the [university].” *Bilicki*, 2019 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 7154 at \*18 citing *Pell v Bd. of Educ. of Union Free Sch. Distr. #1*, 34 N.Y.2d 222 (1974) and *Kelly v Safir*, 96 N.Y.2d 32 [2001]). “Even if this Court were to assume a lesser penalty to be more appropriate, it is not proper to substitute such a view to replace the judgment upheld by the [university].” *Bilicki*, 2019 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 7154 at \*19 citing *Scahill v Greece Cent. Sch. Dist.*, 2 NY3d 754 (2004).

Of course, in the instant case, the issue of whether the sanction shocks the conscience is of no moment as the imposition of sanctions in the first place was improper. However, the Court



writes to address the fact that if in fact Respondent had given proper notice, the sanctions would have been upheld.

Petitioners argue that the imposed sanctions are substantially disproportionate to the alleged offenses given that Petitioners adhered to local New York City and State guidelines for small private gatherings (NYSCEF doc No. 14 at 12). However, Respondent is entitled to maintain requirements for its students' behavior that are stricter than local ordinances.

Petitioners further contend that Respondent's sanction of a semester-long suspension is completely unwarranted as Petitioners all tested negative for COVID-19 following the gatherings, and their classes in the fall 2020 semester are all virtual, meaning they do not even have to enter a campus building to attend their classes and therefore cannot possibly endanger their fellow students (NYSCEF doc No. 14 at 16). Petitioners conclude that the sanction of a suspension completely disregards the factual circumstances at hand.

The Court is unpersuaded by Petitioners' arguments on this matter, and finds that, once again, had proper notice been afforded, the punishments would not constitute egregious sanctions. Furthermore, even if the Court were in agreement that Respondent's sanctions are unduly harsh, the Court cannot micromanage sanctions or substitute its own judgment for that of Respondent. Regardless of whether Petitioners ever posed an actual threat to the health or safety of the NYU community, the fact of the matter is that the type of conduct Petitioners engaged in has played a substantial role in the transmission of COVID-19 and can have a direct impact on the universities; indeed, similar events have resulted in COVID-19 outbreaks and several higher education institutions needing to close to all in-person instruction for the Fall 2020 semester. (NYSCEF doc No. 32, ¶ 16). It is frankly of no moment whether the Court agrees that Respondent chose sanctions that were most fittingly tailored to the egregiousness of Petitioners'



conduct. In summary, had Respondents afforded Petitioners sufficient pre-conduct notice, the sanctions imposed would have all been upheld by this Court.

The Court concludes that although Respondent substantially adhered to its own procedures, did not act arbitrarily in relying on sections E1 and B1 of the Student Conduct Policy, and imposed proper sanctions, the relief sought by Petitioners is nevertheless granted solely on the ground that Petitioners were not afforded clear, concise, full advance notice that the conduct they engaged in, at the time they engaged in it, would subject them to potential discipline.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECLARED that the petitions for relief, pursuant to CPLR Article 78, of petitioners Marc Santonocito, Elnaz Pourasgari, and Ashley Storino (Index Nos. 157787/2020, 157815/2020 and 157947/2020, motion sequence number 001) are granted; to wit:


- (v) It is declared that the separate Decisions made by Respondent New York University (“Respondent” or “NYU”) to suspend Petitioners Marc Santonocito, Elnaz Pourasgari, and Ashley Storino (collectively, “Petitioners”) for the fall 2020 semester are arbitrary, capricious and constitute an abuse of discretion;
- (vi) the Decisions are annulled, voided and vacated;
- (vii) Respondent is directed to remove the disciplinary suspension from each of Petitioners’ official student records;

(viii) Respondent shall allow Petitioners to immediately return to their fall 2020 classes and receive extensions of time to complete work missed as a result of the Decisions; and it is further

ORDERED that Petitioners' application for attorneys' fees is denied; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly; and it is further

ORDERED that counsel for Petitioners shall serve a copy of this order along with notice of entry within twenty (20) days.



20201021161028 CEDMEAD37D6885810E5705E0D86963C4205284E

10/21/2020

DATE

CAROL R. EDMEAD, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:

CASE DISPOSED  
GRANTED  DENIED  
SETTLE ORDER  
INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

NON-FINAL DISPOSITION  
GRANTED IN PART  
SUBMIT ORDER  
FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

OTHER  
REFERENCE

APPLICATION:

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:



# **Exhibit C**

---

---

# New York Supreme Court

## Appellate Division—First Department

---

In the Matter of the Application of

ASHLEY STORINO,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

---

*(For Continuation of Caption See Inside Cover)*

---

---

### **AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS-RESPONDENTS-APPELLANTS**

---

---

DARPANA M. SHETH

*Counsel of Record*

KATLYN PATTON

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN  
EDUCATION

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Foundation  
for Individual Rights in Education*

700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE

Washington, DC 20003

(215) 717-3473

darpana.sheth@thefire.org

---

---

New York County Clerk's Index Nos. 157947/20, 157815/20 and 157787/20

---

---

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04294**

Index No.  
157947/20



---

In the Matter of the Application of

ELNAZ POURASGARI,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04295**

Index No.  
157815/20

---

In the Matter of the Application of

MARC SANTONOCITO,

*Petitioner-Respondent-Appellant,*

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

– against –

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

*Respondent-Appellant-Respondent.*

**Appellate  
Case No.:  
2020-04296**

Index No.  
157787/20

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	3
ARGUMENT.....	4
I.    In Responding to the Coronavirus Pandemic, NYU Has Routinely Violated Students’ Rights .....	4
A.    NYU’s Communications About Its Plans to Manage COVID-19 on Campus Were Unclear .....	5
B.    NYU Improperly Suspended at Least Seventeen Students Similarly-Situated to Petitioners, Illustrating Its Failure to Afford Students Fair Process .....	9
II.   NYU’S Failure to Provide Clear Pre-Conduct Notice Before Suspending Students Is Arbitrary and Capricious .....	12
A.    NYU Promises Its Students Fair Disciplinary Proceedings .....	13
B.    Fair Disciplinary Processes Require Clear Notice of What Conduct Is Prohibited .....	14
C.    NYU’s Student Conduct Regulations Are Too Vague to Provide Clear Notice That Off- Campus Gatherings Are Prohibited Conduct.....	18
CONCLUSION .....	20
PRINTING SPECIFICATIONS STATEMENT .....	21



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases:</b>	
<i>Gold v. Lomenzo</i> , 29 N.Y.2d 468 (1972) .....	15
<i>Grayned v. City of Rockford</i> , 408 U.S. 104 (1972) .....	15, 16
<i>Matter of Doe v. Skidmore Coll.</i> , 152 A.D.3d 932 (3rd Dep’t 2017).....	13
<i>Matter of Powers v. St. John’s Univ. Sch. of Law</i> , 25 N.Y.3d 210, 216 (2015).....	14
<i>Matter of Quercia v. New York Univ.</i> , 41 A.D.3d 295 (1st Dep’t 2007) .....	13
<i>People v. Byron</i> , 17 N.Y.2d 64 (1966) .....	15
<i>Tedeschi v. Wagner Coll.</i> , 49 N.Y.2d 652 (1980) .....	14
<i>Thien et al. v. Bd. of Supervisors of La. State Univ. &amp; Agric. &amp; Mech. Coll.</i> , 271 So. 3d 195 (La. 2019) .....	3
 <b>Statutes &amp; Other Authorities:</b>	
Academic Calendar, New York Univ. ....	10
Adam Barnes, <i>NYU Suspends Over 20 Students for Defying COVID-19 Policies</i> , DAILY CALLER.....	9
Executive Vice President, NYU, <i>Policy on Requirements Related to Access to NYU Buildings and Campus Grounds Resulting from the COVID-19 Pandemic</i> , NEW YORK UNIV. ....	7

<i>FIRE Spotlight Database, New York University, University Student Conduct Policy: Bullying, Threatening, and Abusive Behavior</i> , FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION .....	19
<i>FIRE Statement on COVID-19 restrictions on expressive and associational rights</i> , FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION .....	17
Jan Wolfe & Catherine Koppel, <i>Some U.S. colleges stick to in-person reopening in pandemic despite doubts, pushback</i> , REUTERS .....	4, 16
Letter from Andrew Hamilton, President, NYU, to NYU Parents .....	6
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7801 .....	2
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7802 .....	2
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7803 .....	2, 13
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7804 .....	2
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7805 .....	2
N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7806 .....	2
New York Univ. (@nyuniversity), TWITTER .....	9
Notice from Craig Jolley, Director, NYU Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, to NYU Students .....	7
Notice from Marc Wais, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, NYU, to NYU Students .....	6, 8, 16
Rakesh Kochhar, <i>Unemployment rose higher in three months of COVID-19 than it did in two years of the Great Recession</i> , PEW RESEARCH CENTER .....	16
Robby Soave, <i>An Online Student Attended a Rooftop Party. He Was Reported to NYU and Suspended Indefinitely</i> , REASON ..	11, 12
Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, NYU, <i>University Student Conduct Policy</i> , NEW YORK UNIV. ....	13, 19
<i>Student Conduct: Forum for Resolution</i> , NEW YORK UNIV. ....	13
<i>Submit a Case</i> , FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION .....	11



## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Respondent-Appellant-Respondent New York University (“Respondent” or “NYU”), like many colleges and universities nationwide, decided to reopen for in-person instruction for the fall 2020 semester. NYU administrators sent several communications to students and parents throughout the summer concerning its plans to manage the COVID-19 pandemic. None of these communications clearly notified students that attending off-campus gatherings before the semester began could subject them to serious sanctions, including suspension.

Then, in the weeks and days leading up to the fall 2020 semester, NYU suspended Petitioners-Respondents-Appellants (“Petitioners”) and at least seventeen other students for attending off-campus gatherings. *Amicus* FIRE’s position as an advocate for student due-process rights provides additional information on other NYU students—not only those before this Court—who were subjected to similar procedurally-deficient discipline for attending off-campus gatherings before the semester began. This is an unacceptable abdication of NYU’s obligation to provide students with fair disciplinary processes.

The right to clear notice of prohibited conduct is a basic tenet of fair proceedings, which NYU promises its students. To protect the rights of all NYU students, this Court should affirm that failure to provide students with “clear, concise, and full advance notice” of prohibited conduct (R.20, 29), then punishing them for engaging in that unspecified prohibited conduct, is arbitrary and capricious under New York’s Article 78. N.Y. C.P.L.R. §§ 7801–7806 (2014).

Affirming the trial court’s decision will prevent NYU from abandoning its promise of procedurally fair disciplinary processes. This is of particular importance as NYU students prepare to return to campus for the spring 2021 semester. It will also help vindicate the rights of other students NYU suspended without pre-conduct notice—and who remain subject to disciplinary probation—but who are not before this Court.



## INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*<sup>1</sup>

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (“FIRE”) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting and protecting civil liberties at our nation’s institutions of higher education. Since 1999, FIRE has successfully defended the expressive and due-process rights and academic freedom of thousands of students and faculty members across the United States. FIRE defends these fundamental rights at both public and private institutions by publicly advocating and litigating on behalf of students and faculty members, and participating as *amicus curiae* in cases that implicate these rights, like the one now before this Court. For example, last year FIRE filed an *amicus* brief in support of two students suspended from Louisiana State University’s dental program after the university attempted to exclude them from classes pending its appeal of a loss at the trial court level. *See Thien et al. v. Bd. of Supervisors of La. State Univ. & Agric. & Mech. Coll.*, 271 So. 3d 195 (La. 2019).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Amicus* FIRE affirms that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part and that no person other than *amicus*, its members, or counsel have made any monetary contributions intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

## ARGUMENT

When NYU reopened its New York City campus this fall, it did not inform students that attending off-campus gatherings, even those that complied with state and local regulations, before the semester began was prohibited conduct. Then, it suspended at least twenty students for attending such off-campus gatherings.

Because NYU did not provide students with “clear, concise, and full advance notice” (R.20, 29) that attending off-campus gatherings before the semester began was prohibited conduct, suspending students for this conduct is arbitrary and capricious under Article 78.

### **I. In Responding to the Coronavirus Pandemic, NYU Has Routinely Violated Students’ Rights.**

This fall, colleges and universities across the country faced the challenge of whether and how to reopen campuses during the ongoing coronavirus pandemic.<sup>2</sup> NYU’s failure to clearly communicate to students that attending off-campus gatherings before the semester

---

<sup>2</sup> See Jan Wolfe & Catherine Koppel, *Some U.S. colleges stick to in-person reopening in pandemic despite doubts, pushback*, REUTERS (Aug. 11, 2020, 5:09 AM), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-universities/some-u-s-colleges-stick-to-in-person-reopening-in-pandemic-despite-doubts-pushback-idUSKCN2571HL>.



began would subject them to discipline, and its suspension of twenty students for attending these off-campus gatherings, demonstrates the university's failure to consider students' rights as it reopened for some on-campus instruction.

**A. NYU's Communications About Its Plans to Manage COVID-19 on Campus Were Unclear.**

Respondent chose to re-open its New York City campus for at least some in-person instruction without clearly adopting or communicating to students a policy regarding off-campus gatherings specific to the public health threat.

NYU sent several communications to students and parents over the summer and during the first week of the semester concerning its plans to manage COVID-19 on campus. None of these communications clearly indicated that attending off-campus gatherings—in compliance with state and local public health guidelines—before the semester began would lead to discipline against students.

First, on July 30, NYU Senior Vice President for Student Affairs Marc Wais sent a notice to students titled “COVID-19 Testing, Quarantining, and Early Arrival Procedures for Fall 2020-2021,” which listed testing and quarantine guidelines for students returning to NYU

from states on New York’s travel restrictions list.<sup>3</sup> As the trial court correctly found, this notice did not clearly restrict off-campus gatherings, and it tacitly acknowledged that the restrictions did not apply to conduct that occurred over the summer break, before classes began. R.14. On the same day, NYU President Andrew Hamilton also sent a letter to the parents of NYU students,<sup>4</sup> which the trial court properly found to provide notice only that conduct occurring *during the semester* could result in serious sanctions. R.15.

Second, on August 5, NYU issued its “Policy on Requirements Related to Access to NYU Buildings and Campus Grounds Resulting from the COVID-19 Pandemic,” which required mask-wearing and physical distancing by members of the NYU community in NYU

---

<sup>3</sup> Notice from Marc Wais, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, NYU, to NYU Students (July 30, 2020), <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/coronavirus-information/messages-to-the-community/nyu-returns-important-communication-covid-19-testing-quarantining-and-early-arrival-procedures-for-fall-2020-2021.html>.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Andrew Hamilton, President, NYU, to NYU Parents (July 30, 2020), <https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/communications/letter-to-parents-july302020.html>.



buildings or on campus.<sup>5</sup> The trial court found that this policy was limited by its own terms to conduct occurring on campus *during* the upcoming semester, not before it started. R.16.

Third, Craig Jolley, Director of NYU's Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, sent an email on August 14 to all students instructing them to watch a video and, by August 24, sign a certificate indicating that they had watched and understood the conduct requirements and COVID-19 safety measures.<sup>6</sup> While the trial court found this notice suggested that attending off-campus gatherings may lead to discipline against students, it found that the message still did not provide any notice that NYU expected students to refrain from off-campus gatherings even before the semester began. R.18.

---

<sup>5</sup> Executive Vice President, NYU, *Policy on Requirements Related to Access to NYU Buildings and Campus Grounds Resulting from the COVID-19 Pandemic*, NEW YORK UNIV. (Aug. 5, 2020),

[https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/COVID-19BuildingAccessPolicy\(20200804\).pdf](https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/COVID-19BuildingAccessPolicy(20200804).pdf).

<sup>6</sup> Notice from Craig Jolley, Director, NYU Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, to NYU Students (Aug. 14, 2020),

<https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/coronavirus-information/messages-to-the-community/your-action-required--community-standards-in-the-context-of-covi.html>.

Finally, NYU sent students a message on September 3 titled, “Keeping Each Other Safe: Additional Guidance on University Expectations.”<sup>7</sup> The trial court found that this message provided clear notice that attending unmasked, off-campus gatherings would subject students to discipline, including suspension. In fact, the court found that by sending this communication, NYU acknowledged that its “earlier communications did not sufficiently advise students that off-campus gatherings would subject students to discipline.” R.18. Because students received this message from NYU after the semester started, it still fails to provide clear notice that attending off-campus gatherings when the university is not in session could subject students to discipline.

Although NYU may enforce temporary restrictions on student conduct to address the current threat to public health, it must clearly communicate those restrictions *before* students are subject to discipline.

---

<sup>7</sup> Notice from Marc Wais, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, NYU, to NYU Students (Sept. 3, 2020), <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/coronavirus-information/messages-to-the-community/keeping-each-other-safe-additional-guidance-on-university-expectations.html>.



NYU had several opportunities to do so before the fall 2020 semester began but did not.

**B. NYU Improperly Suspended at Least Seventeen Students Similarly-Situated to Petitioners, Illustrating Its Failure to Afford Students Fair Process.**

Petitioners in this case present three examples of NYU's failure to provide its students with fair disciplinary proceedings this fall. But NYU's own statements, public reporting on its actions, and cases known to FIRE through its advocacy work demonstrate that NYU disciplined at least seventeen additional students for allegedly violating unclear COVID-19 restrictions by attending off-campus gatherings.

On September 5, NYU announced on its official Twitter account that twenty students had been suspended for conduct the university contended violated its COVID-19 regulations.<sup>8</sup> That means twenty students were suspended only *three days* into the fall semester, which

---

<sup>8</sup> New York Univ. (@nyuniversity), TWITTER (Sept. 5, 2020, 6:58 PM), <https://twitter.com/nyuniversity/status/1302380699010433026>. See also Adam Barnes, *NYU Suspends Over 20 Students for Defying COVID-19 Policies*, DAILY CALLER (Sept. 7, 2020, 9:48 AM), <https://dailycaller.com/2020/09/07/new-york-university-coronavirus-students-party>.

began on September 2.<sup>9</sup> And as NYU admits, the sanctions imposed on Petitioners “were similar to others imposed by NYU against students who engaged in behaviors that implicated significant COVID-19 risks . . . .” Resp’t’s Br. 13.

Both NYU’s admission and the similarity of the sanctions levied against these students so early in the semester suggests that they all engaged in similar conduct before the start of the semester. And this inference is supported by the examples for which details are available, which paint a bleak picture of the state of students’ rights at NYU.

At least one student, who spoke with a reporter under the pseudonym “Andy,” explained that he too attended an outdoor, off-campus gathering on August 22, before the semester began, and was informed by NYU’s Director of Student Conduct the next day that he was alleged to have engaged in behavior that presented a public health

---

<sup>9</sup> Academic Calendar, New York Univ., <https://www.nyu.edu/registrar/calendars/university-academic-calendar.html>.



threat.<sup>10</sup> The day after that, he was suspended.<sup>11</sup> Andy appealed the decision, explaining that he had no plans to set foot on NYU's campus that semester and was completing his courses remotely.<sup>12</sup> His appeal was rejected.<sup>13</sup>

As part of FIRE's work promoting and protecting civil liberties in higher education, students and faculty can report instances of alleged rights violations on our website.<sup>14</sup> FIRE was contacted by four other students whom NYU suspended this fall for attending off-campus gatherings.

For example, one student was suspended on September 1 after he attended a surprise birthday party that his friends, who do not attend NYU, planned for him off-campus in late August. Like Andy, this student was enrolled in remote courses, and one hybrid course that he

---

<sup>10</sup> Robby Soave, *An Online Student Attended a Rooftop Party. He Was Reported to NYU and Suspended Indefinitely*, REASON (Sept. 17, 2020, 11:49 AM), <https://reason.com/2020/09/17/nyu-coronavirus-online-learning-expelled>.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Submit a Case*, FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION, <https://www.thefire.org/resources/submit-a-case>.

could choose to complete remotely. He had no plans to return to NYU's campus during the fall semester. Like Petitioners, NYU's sanctions against this student included suspension for one semester, placing him on disciplinary probation until August 2021, and requiring him to complete a reflection paper on the role young people have played in spreading COVID-19. R.11.

These suspensions carry severe educational and financial consequences for students. Andy, for example, faces losing the full-tuition scholarship on which he relies to attend NYU.<sup>15</sup> One of the students in contact with FIRE also faces the loss of a scholarship.

Ultimately, in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, NYU violated many of its students' rights to a fair disciplinary process by failing to provide clear notice of the kinds of conduct that could result in suspension from the university.

## **II. NYU'S Failure to Provide Clear Pre-Conduct Notice Before Suspending Students Is Arbitrary and Capricious.**

While students at private colleges and universities like NYU are not afforded the "full panoply" of due-process rights afforded to students

---

<sup>15</sup> Soave, *supra* note 10.



at public institutions, *Matter of Doe v. Skidmore Coll.*, 152 A.D.3d 932, 934–35 (3rd Dep’t 2017), they are entitled to a disciplinary process that complies with university published rules and guidelines and is not arbitrary and capricious. *Matter of Quercia v. New York Univ.*, 41 A.D.3d 295, 296 (1st Dep’t 2007); N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 7803 (2014). The trial court distilled the requirement of fair notice to a standard that protects students’ rights by requiring colleges and universities to provide students with “clear, concise, and full advance notice” of prohibited conduct—and properly concluded that NYU failed to meet it.

**A. NYU Promises Its Students Fair Disciplinary Proceedings.**

NYU guarantees students “procedural fairness” in its disciplinary proceedings,<sup>16</sup> and promises that “any student accused of violating University policy . . . is afforded a fair and impartial process.”<sup>17</sup> While this

---

<sup>16</sup> Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, NYU, *University Student Conduct Policy*, NEW YORK UNIV. (Aug. 12, 2020), <https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/UniversityStudentConductPolicy2020.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> *Student Conduct: Forum for Resolution*, NEW YORK UNIV., <https://www.nyu.edu/students/student-information-and-resources/student-community-standards/studentconductforums.html>.

promise of fairness does not guarantee NYU students the full protections of due-process afforded to students at public institutions, it does provide this Court a standard by which to review NYU's disciplinary processes. A court may review and reverse a private university's disciplinary decision when it acts arbitrarily [or] "fails to abide by its own rules . . . ." *Matter of Powers v. St. John's Univ. Sch. of Law*, 25 N.Y.3d 210, 216 (2015). NYU's own rules promise fairness. Further, holding NYU to its promises is "a matter of essential fairness in the somewhat one-sided relationship between the institution and the individual." *Tedeschi v. Wagner Coll.*, 49 N.Y.2d 652, 660 (1980).

It violates this promise of fairness to discipline students for rules that did not yet publicly exist at the time the purportedly prohibited conduct occurred.

**B. Fair Disciplinary Processes Require Clear Notice of What Conduct Is Prohibited.**

Basic tenets of fairness demand that NYU provide its students with clear notice of the type of conduct that is prohibited before students risk serious discipline by engaging in prohibited conduct.

The trial court held that "clear, concise, and full advance notice" is the standard for the pre-conduct notice due to students at private



colleges and universities. R.20. This standard ensures disciplinary proceedings follow the basic tenets of fairness, which NYU promises to its students.

Unclear, vague rules and regulations are incompatible with this promise of fairness. As the Supreme Court of the United States has explained, “[i]t is a basic principle of due process that an enactment is void for vagueness if its prohibitions are not clearly defined.” *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108 (1972); *see also Gold v. Lomenzo*, 29 N.Y.2d 468, 477 (1972) (holding a statute is not void for vagueness if “a reasonable man . . . would be informed of the nature of the offense prohibited and what is required of him” (quoting *People v. Byron*, 17 N.Y.2d 64, 67 (1966))). This is because “[v]ague laws may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning,” and delegate matters of policy to decision-makers—in this case, NYU administrators—without providing clear standards, inviting arbitrary enforcement. *Grayned*, 408 U.S. at 108–09.

On September 3, when NYU at last communicated that off-campus gatherings could subject them to serious disciplinary sanctions, Wais said NYU had “no desire to subject its students to conduct

proceedings . . . [or] to create a ‘Gotcha!’ atmosphere.”<sup>18</sup> But by failing to specify that this included gatherings before the start of the semester, the university effectively “trap[ped] [] innocent” Petitioners and at least seventeen other students, including some who were engaged entirely in remote learning for the fall semester. *Grayned*, 408 U.S. at 108.

Exacerbating this infringement on students’ rights is that NYU subjected students to the serious sanction of suspension from the university. This has an impact not only on the students’ educational progress but also on their financial security during a pandemic that has left many jobless.<sup>19</sup>

Efforts by colleges and universities across the country to reopen campuses presented threats to students’ expressive, associational, and

---

<sup>18</sup> Notice from Wais, *supra* note 7.

<sup>19</sup> See Rakesh Kochhar, *Unemployment rose higher in three months of COVID-19 than it did in two years of the Great Recession*, PEW RESEARCH CENTER (June 11, 2020), <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/06/11/unemployment-rose-higher-in-three-months-of-covid-19-than-it-did-in-two-years-of-the-great-recession/>. Further, suspending a student right before or days into a semester often negatively impacts a student’s ability to receive a full refund on tuition. This only lends credit to concerns by some that universities reopening plans are primarily driven by their own financial considerations. See Wolfe & Koppel, *supra* note 2.



due-process rights.<sup>20</sup> In evaluating reports from students about the new restrictions, FIRE looked to several factors to determine whether guidelines concerning public health practices were sufficiently protective of student rights. These basic tenets of fairness are that restrictions and regulations on conduct be: “(1) clearly communicated to all students and faculty, particularly if they deviate from otherwise applicable state or local requirements; (2) published and announced as soon as possible and prior to any enforcement; and (3) consistently enforced.”<sup>21</sup>

The trial court’s holding emphasizes two of these important tenets: that the regulations be clearly communicated and that they be published and announced as soon as practicable, before enforcement.

Petitioners were disciplined on August 27, before NYU’s semester began and before the university made it clear that their behavior could subject them to discipline. By that date, NYU had already sent four

---

<sup>20</sup> *FIRE Statement on COVID-19 restrictions on expressive and associational rights*, FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION (Sept. 8, 2020), <https://www.thefire.org/fire-statement-on-covid-19-restrictions-on-expressive-and-associational-rights/>.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

communications to students and parents concerning its plans to manage the pandemic on campus during the fall 2020 semester. None of them made clear that conduct such as Petitioners' would subject students to discipline.

**C. NYU's Student Conduct Regulations Are Too Vague to Provide Clear Notice That Off-Campus Gatherings Are Prohibited Conduct.**

Vague regulations do not provide students with clear notice of the type of conduct that is prohibited—especially during an unprecedented public health crisis—and invite administrative abuse.

The COVID-19 pandemic has challenged the world, including institutions of higher education, with once-in-a-century circumstances. The published student conduct rules and guidelines that NYU had in place before the pandemic cannot be expected to stretch to fit these circumstances. New regulations and restrictions enacted on a temporary basis to protect public health are necessary, but must be accompanied by fair notice of prohibited conduct—especially in situations where the conduct would have been not just permissible, but entirely unremarkable, just a few months earlier.



The trial court explained that it may have found that two of NYU’s disciplinary policies<sup>22</sup>—B1, regulating threatening behavior, and E1, regulating disruptive behavior—served as a rational basis for discipline against Petitioners. R.26. But this would only have been the case if NYU had provided sufficient pre-conduct notice of the types of conduct that could be disciplined under these provisions as it relates to public health and COVID-19. It did not do so.

It is unsurprising that section E1 of NYU’s Student Conduct Policy, prohibiting disruptive behavior, would be used as a sweeping basis for discipline. It earns FIRE’s “yellow light” rating,<sup>23</sup> meaning it is ambiguous enough to easily allow for administrative abuse.<sup>24</sup> The

---

<sup>22</sup> Senior Vice-President for Student Affairs, *University Student Code of Conduct Policy*, NEW YORK UNIV. (Aug. 12, 2020), <https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/UniversityStudentConductPolicy2020.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> *FIRE Spotlight Database, New York University, University Student Conduct Policy: Bullying, Threatening, and Abusive Behavior*, FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION (Sept. 12, 2020), [https://www.thefire.org/fire\\_speech-codes/nyu-disruptive-behavior/](https://www.thefire.org/fire_speech-codes/nyu-disruptive-behavior/).


<sup>24</sup> *FIRE Spotlight Database, Using the Database*, FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION, <https://www.thefire.org/resources/spotlight/using-the-spotlight-database> (last visited Dec. 17, 2020).

pandemic and NYU's actions here have highlighted the threat vague codes of conduct present to student rights. The trial court's clear pre-conduct notice standard protects students from arbitrary and capricious disciplinary sanctions based on these vague regulations. This vagueness continues to present concerns, as the COVID-19 pandemic is an ever-evolving situation. As the holidays approach, NYU students are likely off-campus and returning home to their families. To ensure that when classes resume in January other students do not suffer from arbitrary and capricious discipline as Petitioners have, this Court should uphold the trial court's finding: NYU must provide students with "clear, concise, and full advance notice" of what conduct is prohibited.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should affirm the Supreme Court, New York County's ruling.

Dated: December 22, 2020



Darpana M. Sheth  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL  
RIGHTS IN EDUCATION  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE  
Suite 340  
Washington, DC 20003  
(215) 717-3473  
darpana.sheth@thefire.org



## **PRINTING SPECIFICATIONS STATEMENT**

Pursuant to 22 NYCRR Section 1250.8(j) the foregoing brief was prepared on a computer using Microsoft Word.

**TYPE:** A proportionally spaced typeface was used as follows:

Name of Typeface: Century Schoolbook

Font Size: 14

Line Spacing: Double

**WORD COUNT:** The total number of words in the brief, inclusive of point headings and footnotes and exclusive of pages containing the table of contents, table of citations, proof of service and certificate of compliance, or any authorized addendum containing statutes, rules, regulations, etc. is 3,357.