

EASTMORE OWNERS CORP.
Legal Committee Statement to Shareholders

6/29/2026

To All Eastmore Shareholders:

In our June 9, 2026 letter the Legal Committee referred to the Federal Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") discrimination complaint filed by Ms. Zelmanovich in 2024. We are pleased to advise all residents that HUD dismissed the discrimination complaint on June 15, 2026. Attached is a copy of the HUD decision.

While Ms. Zelmanovich's claims in her action commenced in the Supreme Court of the State of New York remain pending, the Eastmore is represented by counsel retained by its insurance company to continue to defend against those allegations.

Respectfully,

The Legal Committee of the Eastmore Owners Corp.

Drew Daly, Lori Fierstein, Nancy Friedman, JB Kresser, David Spector, Lynda Wertheim

DETERMINATION OF NO REASONABLE CAUSE

CASE NAME: Zelmanovich, Blanche v. Allied Partners Inc., et al.
CASE NUMBER: 02-25-5062-8

I. JURISDICTION

Blanche Zelmanovich ("Complainant") alleges that Respondent Eastmore Owners Corp. ("Respondent Eastmore") and Respondent Allied Partners Management LLC ("Respondent APM") (collectively "Respondents"), discriminated against her on the basis of disability¹ and retaliated against her. Specifically, Complainant alleges Respondents denied her a reasonable accommodation, started eviction proceedings against her, and refused her maintenance payments as a form of retaliation due to her submitting a reasonable accommodation request. If proven, the allegations would constitute violations of Sections 804(f)(2), 804(f)(3)(b), 804(f)(1)2 and 818 of the Fair Housing Act. The most recent act of discrimination is alleged to have occurred on October 3, 2024, and is continuing. The complaint was timely filed on November 7, 2024. The subject property ("Subject Property"), known as The Eastmore, is located at 240 East 76th Street, New York, New York. Respondent Eastmore is the owner of the Subject Property and Respondent APM is the managing agent of the Subject Property.

II. COMPLAINANT'S ALLEGATIONS

Complainant alleges that Respondents denied her request to keep her medically prescribed assistance animal; a 15 lbs. dog, and instead began eviction proceedings against her in retaliation for requesting a reasonable accommodation. Complainant alleges she informed Respondents of her disability and the medical necessity of having the animal, including by providing them with a letter from her treating psychologist dated October 26, 2021.

Complainant further states that Respondent Eastmore retaliated against her by refusing to accept her monthly maintenance payments, even after she offered to pay them without prejudice to their rights in the eviction proceeding.

III. RESPONDENTS' DEFENSES

Respondents deny all allegations of discrimination.

Respondents indicated dogs weighing less than 20 pounds, such as Complainant's, are permitted to reside at the Subject Property.

¹ The Act uses the term "handicap," whereas this document uses the term "disability." Both terms have the same legal meaning. See *Bragdon v. Abbott*, 524 U.S. 624, 631 (1988).

² The investigation revealed the reasonable accommodation was requested in 2021 and is therefore untimely. As such, the alleged violations on 804(f)(2), 804(f)(3)(b) and 804(f)(1) are hereby dismissed.

Respondents stated there were approximately 50 reported complaints about noise coming from Complainant's dog before an Amended Notice of Default was issued on December 13, 2021. Respondents also stated the Board and the resident that lived above Complainant offered to pay for barking obedience training for Complainant's dog, but Complainant refused the offer. Due to the continued barking, Respondents began eviction proceedings.

Respondents stated due to ongoing litigation surrounding the eviction, they could not accept the monthly maintenance payments.

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Section 818 -- Retaliation

In order to prevail in a *prima facie* case of discriminatory retaliation, Complainant needs to satisfy the following elements

1. The Complainant engaged in an activity protected by the Act, or aided/encouraged another to do so.
2. The Respondent subjected Complainant to adverse action.
3. Circumstantial evidence exists of a causal link between the protected activity and the adverse action. Examples of such circumstantial evidence include (a) temporal link between the protected activity and adverse actions (b) similarly situated persons who did not engage in a protected activity and who were not subject to the adverse action; (c) selective enforcement against the complainant of generally applicable policy.

All elements must be satisfied.

Complainant failed to satisfy element 1.

Complainant alleges she requested a reasonable accommodation and believed she was subject to two adverse actions; an eviction and refusal of maintenance payments.

However, a reasonable accommodation is an exception to the rules, policies, practices, or services of the Subject Property. The Subject Property accepts dogs weighing less than 20 lbs. Complainant's assistance animal meets the Subject Property's requirements.

Therefore, Complainant did not request a reasonable accommodation and therefore did not engage in a protected activity under the Act. Respondents initiated eviction proceedings and refused maintenance payments due to Complainant's violations of her lease and the house rules, specifically, noise disturbances from Complainant's animal.

Complainant has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of a violation of Section 818 on the basis of disability. The Department finds that Respondent is not in violation of the Act, as alleged.



V. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A copy of the Final Investigative Report ("FIR") can be obtained by sending an email request to Ivette.M.Rivera-Giusti@hud.gov. Include the case name, number and "FIR Request" in the subject line of your message. Email is the preferred communication method.

If you are unable to send your request via email, please direct your FIR request to: Ivette Rivera-Giusti, Region II Director, Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 3532, New York, New York 10278-0068. Please be aware that it will take longer to respond to mail requests.

6/15/2026

Date



Ivette M. Rivera-Giusti
Region II Director
Office of Fair Housing
and Equal Opportunity

