

SFC-Part45-Clerk@nycourts.gov

Thomas P. Giuffra, Esq.

Ethan J. Cohen, Esq.

Rheingold Giuffra Ruffo Plotkin & Hellman LLP

551 Fifth Avenue, 29th Floor

New York, NY 10176

RE: FORMAL NOTICE TO CEASE AND DESIST — Attempts to Identify, Intimidate, Harass, or Interfere with the Anonymous Publishers of LucyCraig.blog

Reference: *Jane Doe v. Cornell University, Inc., et al.*

Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County

Index No. 161704/2026

NYSCEF Document No. 66, filed October 14, 2026

Dear Mr. Giuffra and Mr. Cohen:

We write on behalf of the anonymous administrators and publishers of <https://lucycraig.blog>, an independently operated online publication dedicated to public discourse, documentary research, commentary, criticism, and discussion concerning the highly publicized litigation involving your client.

Consider this both an introduction and a formal notice that any effort to intimidate, harass, improperly identify, expose, or otherwise interfere with the constitutionally protected activities of this publication and its anonymous administrators must cease and desist.

We have reviewed your October 14, 2026 correspondence to Justice Phaedra F. Perry-Bond, filed as NYSCEF Document No. 66. Frankly, we find portions of your letter remarkable—not because of the legal principles you articulate, many of which we agree with, but because of the apparent disconnect between your professed devotion to the First Amendment and your characterization of those who exercise that same constitutional protection to challenge your preferred narrative.

1. WHO WE ARE — AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, WHO WE ARE NOT

LucyCraig.blog is an independent, anonymously administered publication providing a platform for examination and discussion of matters of substantial public concern.

The publication hosts commentary, publicly accessible legal documents, research materials, media, and an open discussion forum in which participants may express opposing interpretations of the available evidence.

For the avoidance of doubt:

- We have **no affiliation, contractual relationship, agency relationship, or coordination with any plaintiff or defendant** in the underlying litigation.
- We have **no relationship with any attorney, law firm, judge, judicial officer, prosecutor, or investigator** participating in the proceedings.
- We have **no institutional, professional, or operational connection to Cornell University, Ithaca, or New York City**, or to the underlying jurisdiction.
- We are not acting at the direction of any litigant, defense attorney, public-relations representative, or supposed litigation surrogate.
- We have no obligation to endorse your client's allegations, accept your characterization of disputed evidence, or surrender our anonymity to satisfy your curiosity.

We are independent speakers and publishers. Our interests are the free exchange of ideas, transparency, public accountability, and the ability of ordinary individuals to examine competing arguments without having their conclusions dictated by attorneys, media executives, or self-appointed arbiters of acceptable opinion.

Your litigation does not transform independent commentators into agents of the defendants simply because their opinions differ from yours.

Nor does the publicity surrounding your case confer upon you authority over journalists, publishers, or members of the public who choose to participate anonymously.

2. YOUR OWN OCTOBER 14 PLEADING UNDERMINES ANY ATTEMPT TO SILENCE INDEPENDENT SPEAKERS

In your October 14 correspondence, at page 7, you invoke *Ash v. Board of Managers of the 155 Condominium*, 44 A.D.3d 324 (1st Dep't 2007), and explain that prior restraints on speech carry a heavy presumption against constitutional validity.

You further argue at page 6 that vague prohibitions may impermissibly chill protected speech and that any permissible restriction must be narrowly tailored.

We agree.

Indeed, you have supplied an excellent explanation of why a civil lawsuit should not become an instrument for suppressing public commentary.

The difficulty, Mr. Giuffra, is that **the First Amendment does not belong exclusively to attorneys with television appearances, sympathetic journalists, or speakers who agree with your client's version of events.**

It belongs equally to those whose opinions you dislike.

Your pleading further insists, at page 11, that restrictions must not improperly advantage one side of a public debate by preventing the other from responding.

Again, we agree.

But this principle is not a one-way street. If your client and her representatives are entitled to advocate their interpretation of disputed evidence publicly, then independent publishers are equally entitled to examine that interpretation, challenge its factual premises, criticize your litigation strategy, and publish lawful commentary reflecting competing perspectives.

You cannot credibly invoke constitutional principles to protect your own media appearances while treating independent, oppositional commentary as inherently illegitimate.

3. CALLING OPPOSING SPEAKERS "BIGOTS" IS UNPROFESSIONAL AND POTENTIALLY RAISES ETHICAL CONCERNS

On page 4 of your October 14 correspondence, you state:

"As new limited details about the case were released, bigots online rushed to the defense of the alleged perpetrators and attacked Jane Doe and other survivors of sexual assault."

That is an extraordinary generalization to place before a court.

The term *bigots* is not a substitute for evidence, nor is it an acceptable blanket characterization of individuals who dispute allegations, question witness credibility, review court records, or disagree with a litigant's public-relations strategy.

There is an enormous legal and moral distinction between threatening an individual and criticizing that individual's claims.

There is likewise a difference between harassment and constitutionally protected criticism—even criticism that is sarcastic, vulgar, unflattering, or offensive.

You know this distinction. Your own pleading depends upon it.

Yet your chosen rhetoric risks collapsing these categories into a convenient narrative in which your client's supporters are principled advocates and her critics are presumed malicious.

Such rhetoric is unbecoming of an experienced attorney making representations to a court.

New York Rule of Professional Conduct 4.4(a) prohibits lawyers, in representing clients, from using means having no substantial purpose other than to embarrass or harm third persons, or methods of obtaining evidence that violate their legal rights.

We do not suggest that an isolated use of the word *bigots* automatically establishes an ethical violation. However, inflammatory characterizations combined with any improper attempt to intimidate, expose, or retaliate against unrelated speakers could raise substantially more serious professional-responsibility questions.

We expect attorneys appearing before the New York Supreme Court to distinguish legitimate public criticism from actual misconduct rather than casually conflating the two.

Disagreement is not bigotry. Criticism is not harassment. Anonymous publication is not evidence of wrongdoing.

And the mere fact that independent speakers refuse to repeat your preferred narrative does not make them participants in some imaginary conspiracy.

4. THE RIGHT TO ANONYMOUS PUBLICATION IS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED

We draw your attention to *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission*, 514 U.S. 334 (1995), and *Talley v. California*, 362 U.S. 60 (1960).

These decisions recognize the longstanding constitutional protection afforded to anonymous expression.

As the Supreme Court explained in *McIntyre*, anonymity protects unpopular speakers from retaliation and preserves their ability to participate in public debate without compulsory personal identification.

That protection is particularly important where the subject involves controversial litigation, powerful institutions, public figures, or substantial public hostility.

The administrators of LucyCraig.blog have chosen to publish anonymously. That decision is deliberate, lawful, and not subject to negotiation with opposing counsel in litigation to which we are strangers.

We do not need your permission to publish.

We do not need your approval to criticize your arguments.

And we certainly do not owe you our names, residential addresses, employment information, personal associations, or other identifying information merely because we operate a publication that refuses to accept your client's allegations as established fact.

The First Amendment does not create absolute immunity from lawful investigation or properly authorized judicial process. But neither does it permit anonymity to be disregarded simply because a lawyer dislikes the content of a publication.

Any legitimate effort to compel identifying information would require an appropriate legal basis and procedures that respect the constitutional interests involved.

5. FORMAL DEMAND TO CEASE AND DESIST

Accordingly, we formally demand that you, your firm, your agents, and any persons acting at your direction:

1. **Cease and desist from any improper effort to identify, expose, dox, intimidate, harass, or retaliate against the anonymous administrators, contributors, or operators of LucyCraig.blog.**
2. Refrain from encouraging or facilitating third parties to discover or disclose nonpublic personal identifying information concerning those individuals for purposes of intimidation, retaliation, or suppression of lawful speech.
3. Refrain from making unsupported representations to courts, media outlets, or other third parties suggesting that this independent publication is controlled, funded, coordinated, or directed by any defendant or attorney in the underlying litigation.
4. Refrain from employing threats of litigation, professional consequences, reputational retaliation, or other coercive tactics for the purpose of deterring constitutionally protected commentary.
5. Preserve any existing communications, instructions, or records concerning efforts to identify or investigate the publication's anonymous administrators, to the extent preservation is required by applicable law or reasonably anticipated litigation.
6. Direct any legitimate legal objections concerning specific published material through appropriate, lawful channels rather than attempting to intimidate anonymous speakers or bypass applicable procedural safeguards.

These demands are directed toward improper conduct and are not intended to obstruct legitimate legal representation, lawful investigation, good-faith reporting, or properly authorized judicial proceedings.

We also request written confirmation that neither your firm nor persons acting at its direction are undertaking efforts to expose the identities of our administrators for retaliatory or speech-suppressive purposes.

6. WE WILL NOT BE INTIMIDATED INTO SILENCE

Your October 14 letter repeatedly complains that your client and her representatives should not be deprived of the ability to respond to criticism.

On this narrow issue, we are in complete agreement.

Your client has every right to present her allegations.

You have every right to advocate on her behalf within the boundaries of applicable law and professional obligations.

The defendants have every right to deny those allegations and defend themselves.

And the public has every right to examine the evidence, question the attorneys, scrutinize the proceedings, ridicule weak arguments, and reach conclusions you may find deeply objectionable.

What you do not possess is a veto over public opinion.

Nor does the seriousness of the allegations suspend the constitutional protections afforded to individuals who disagree with you.

We condemn genuine threats, unlawful harassment, and intimidation regardless of the target. Nothing in this correspondence defends such conduct.

But we refuse to accept the increasingly fashionable proposition that disagreement with an accuser constitutes an attack upon every survivor of sexual assault.

That proposition is intellectually dishonest, legally unsustainable, and fundamentally hostile to the adversarial process you have spent decades practicing.

Indeed, your own description of the right to respond to criticism should make this point painfully obvious.

7. FINAL NOTICE

We encourage you to reread your October 14 submission, particularly pages 6 through 11.

Your arguments concerning prior restraints, viewpoint diversity, overbreadth, and the chilling effect of speech restrictions are compelling.

We suggest you apply those principles consistently.

LucyCraig.blog will continue publishing, hosting lawful public discussion, examining publicly available records, and allowing competing perspectives to be heard.

Our administrators will remain anonymous unless they independently decide otherwise or disclosure is lawfully compelled through appropriate procedures.

We will not be bullied into disclosure, intimidated into editorial compliance, or pressured into abandoning a lawful publication simply because its existence complicates your litigation narrative.

Should credible evidence emerge of improper attempts to intimidate, retaliate against, or unlawfully identify our administrators, we reserve all available rights and remedies, including seeking appropriate judicial relief or making a substantiated complaint to the relevant professional disciplinary authorities.

We make no claim that your firm has already committed such misconduct. This letter puts you on notice of our position and our expectation that the rights of independent third-party publishers will be respected.

Mr. Giuffra, you have eloquently defended your right to speak. We expect you to demonstrate an equally robust respect for ours.

The Constitution is not a litigation accessory to be worn when convenient and discarded when the opposition speaks.

We trust that message requires no further explanation.

Sincerely,

The Anonymous Administrators

LucyCraig.blog

Independent Publication and Public Discussion Forum

<https://lucycraig.blog>

All rights expressly reserved. No waiver of anonymity, privacy, constitutional protections, or other rights is intended by this correspondence.