





2. In 2006, Plaintiff brought the mouse model and her know-how with her to Columbia, and has always asserted her ownership of the mouse model.

3. Despite the foregoing, since 2016, and to this day, Columbia and Gogos – Plaintiff’s ex-husband and a Columbia employee – began to claim ownership of the mouse model in scientific journals and press releases issued to the public, and, upon information and belief, through applications for funding from National Institutes of Health (“NIH”) and other funding agencies. Incredibly, Columbia has also attempted to license the mouse model for its own benefit without the prior knowledge, consent or approval of Plaintiff, and upon information and belief, continues to do so. In sum, Defendants have attempted to steal Plaintiff’s life’s work for their own benefit.

4. As alleged more fully below, Plaintiff has suffered both significant monetary and reputational damages as a result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct and if permitted to continue, she will continue to suffer irreparable harm.

**THE PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff Dr. Karayiorgou is an individual residing at 4600 Delafield Avenue, Bronx, New York.

6. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant, Columbia is an organization with its principal place of business located in New York, New York.

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Gogos is an individual and resident of the State of New York, County of New York.

8. Defendants XYZ Corporation(s) 1-5 are sued herein under fictitious names because the true identities of said entities are presently unknown to Plaintiff, except that such entities are in some manner connected to Columbia and engaged or participated in the wrongful

conduct alleged herein. Plaintiff intends to seek leave to add the true names of such parties when same are ascertained.

**FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

**Background**

9. Defendant Columbia is an academic institution of higher-learning which includes, *inter alia*, the Columbia University Medical Center, including its subsidiary Department of Psychiatry and Psychiatry Medical Genetics Division.

10. Columbia's Department of Psychiatry and Psychiatry Medical Genetics Division engages in research of, *inter alia*, various brain disorders that affect mental function and behavior and the treatment of same.

11. Dr. Karayiorgou is a medical doctor who earned her medical degree from the National Capodistrian University of Athens, Greece. She completed her post-doctoral training at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

12. Dr. Karayiorgou is a distinguished research scientist who has dedicated her life to research in the area of schizophrenia. She is widely credited with identifying, through her human genetic studies, the first robust genetic risk factor in schizophrenia in 1995 (*i.e.*, the 22q11.2 deletion), and for her innovative use of mouse modeling studies.

13. Among other things, Plaintiff has been published numerous times in prestigious academic and medical journals, lectured at dozens of highly selective academic presentations, and has had her work cited numerous times in the research papers of other scientists. She has also received numerous accolades for her work in the area of schizophrenia by prestigious organizations.

14. Gogos was Plaintiff's husband. Dr. Karayiorgou and Gogos divorced in December 2014.

**Plaintiff Creates Df(16)A<sup>+/-</sup> Mouse Model of Human 22q11.2 Micro Deletion**

15. From 1996 through 2006, Plaintiff was employed by The Rockefeller University, where she became the Principal Investigator of her namesake research laboratory (the "Karayiorgou Laboratory", which was also known as "The Human Neurogenetics Laboratory").

16. As alleged above, Dr. Karayiorgou, in 1995, prior to joining The Rockefeller University, had identified the first robust genetic risk factor in schizophrenia.

17. After Dr. Karayiorgou became affiliated with The Rockefeller University, she continued her research in the area of schizophrenia and began developing a mouse model containing same genetic risk factor.

18. In 2003, Plaintiff completed the development, creation and generation of Df(16)A<sup>+/-</sup> Mouse Model of Human 22q11.2 Micro Deletion (the "Mouse Model") while at The Rockefeller University.

19. At all times, Plaintiff was the sole owner of the Mouse Model, and all progeny thereof.

20. At all times, Plaintiff undertook great efforts to keep access to the Mouse Model under her strict control.

21. For instance, Plaintiff required her express permission in order for anyone to utilize the Mouse Model, and that all work with respect thereto be performed in conjunction with Plaintiff.

22. While at The Rockefeller University and after her creation of the Mouse Model, Dr. Karayiorgou engaged in research projects focusing on the analysis of the Mouse Model.

During this time, Gogos -- Dr. Karayiorgou's husband at the time and a post-doctoral candidate at Columbia -- began moonlighting as a visiting fellow at the Karayiorgou Laboratory, and worked with Dr. Karayiorgou on applications of research of the Mouse Model. Subsequently, Gogos began working with Dr. Karayiorgou on a full-time basis to support her research and analysis of the Mouse Model.

**Plaintiff Joins Columbia**

23. In or about July 2006, Plaintiff left The Rockefeller University and joined Columbia as a Professor of Psychiatry. She was later appointed Acting Chief of the Division of Medical Genetics.

24. Dr. Karayiorgou brought the Karayiorgou Laboratory with her to Columbia's Medical Genetics Division of the Department of Psychiatry.

25. Among other things, Dr. Karayiorgou also brought the Mouse Model with her to Columbia.

26. While at Columbia, Dr. Karayiorgou continued performing analysis on the Mouse Model, and received grants to perform such analysis at Columbia.

27. Gogos, who was an assistant professor at Columbia at the time, continued acting in a supporting role in connection with Dr. Karayiorgou's analysis of the Mouse Model and research, and performed research on the Mouse Model in his own laboratory at Columbia with Plaintiff's approval and under her strict supervision (until 2017).

28. In December 2014, Dr. Karayiorgou and Gogos were divorced. Although they had divorced, Dr. Karayiorgou and Gogos continued working together on the Mouse Model until some time in 2017 for the specific aims of the federally funded grant.

29. In 2017 Dr. Karayiorgou and Gogos ceased working together with respect to the analysis of the Mouse Model.

30. At all times, Dr. Karayiorgou maintained her sole and exclusive ownership of the Mouse Model (and all derivatives and progeny thereof). At all times while at Columbia, Plaintiff undertook great efforts to maintain her exclusive control of (and exclusive access to) the Mouse Model.

31. For instance, Plaintiff required her express permission in order for anyone to utilize the Mouse Model, and required that all work with respect to same be performed in conjunction with Plaintiff.

**Plaintiff Learns that Columbia Permitted the Unauthorized Use of the Mouse Model and Sought to License the Mouse Model to a Third-Party**

32. In or about February 2016, Dr. Karayiorgou learned that Gogos was undertaking research and analysis on the Mouse Model (and other mouse models) without her authority or approval, and outside the scope of the federally funded grant that she was directing.

33. Upon information and belief, Gogos engaged in the foregoing wrongful conduct with the approval of Columbia.

34. In press releases issued by Columbia, Columbia incorrectly attributed ownership of the Mouse Model (and other mouse modeling research of Plaintiff) to Gogos and Columbia, and failed to attribute ownership of same to Plaintiff.

35. In February 2016, Plaintiff demanded the return of the Mouse Model from Gogos, and made demand to Gogos and Columbia that all unauthorized work on the Mouse Model by Gogos (and anyone else at Columbia) cease immediately.

36. In or about February 2018 December 2017, Dr. Karayiorgou learned that Columbia was engaged in negotiations with a third-party to license the Mouse Model, for a fee, and for its own benefit.

37. Dr. Karayiorgou never gave her consent or authorization to Columbia to license the Mouse Model to any third-party.

38. Despite Dr. Karayiorgou's sole and exclusive ownership of the Mouse Model (and all derivatives and progeny thereof), Columbia has taken the position that it is the owner of the Mouse Model, or otherwise has the right to license and/or transfer rights in the Mouse Model.

39. Further, despite numerous demands, Columbia has failed and refused to cause Gogos to cease and desist from using and distributing the Mouse Model.

40. Upon information and belief, Gogos continues to engage in the aforementioned wrongful and unlawful conduct to the date of this Complaint.

41. Moreover, upon information and belief, Gogos is in possession of progeny of the Mouse Model without the consent or approval of Plaintiff.

42. \_Gogos has never received the consent or approval of Plaintiff to possess or use or distribute the Mouse Model or the progeny of the Mouse Model for purposes other than for his work with Plaintiff for the aims of the federally funded grant.

43. Gogos has failed and refused to return the Mouse Model and the progeny thereof in his possession.

44. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has, and will continue to, suffer severe monetary and reputational damages, and other irreparable harm.

**AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
(Declaratory Judgment)

45. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

46. As alleged above, Plaintiff created, developed and generated the Mouse Model prior to being employed at Columbia.

47. As a result, neither Columbia, nor Gogos, have any ownership or proprietary rights in the Mouse Model, or any derivatives or progeny thereof, nor do they have any rights to any intellectual property that may result from the access to and/or analyses of the Mouse Model.

48. Further, as alleged above, Plaintiff is the sole and exclusive owner of all proprietary rights in the Mouse Model, and any derivatives or progeny thereof.

49. Columbia and/or Gogos now assert that they have an ownership interest in the Mouse Model.

50. As a result of the foregoing, there is a real and justiciable controversy between Plaintiff and Defendants that is ripe for adjudication.

51. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to a judgment declaring that she is the sole and exclusive owner of the Mouse Model, and that neither Columbia, nor Gogos, have any ownership interest in the Mouse Model, its progeny or derivatives, or in any of the intellectual property resulting from their improper and unlawful use of the Mouse Model.

**AS AND FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
(Conversion/Unfair Competition)

52. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

53. Plaintiff is the owner of, and has the immediate, exclusive, and present right to possession of, and use of, and distribution of, the Mouse Model, and all derivatives and progeny thereof.

54. As set forth above, Plaintiff has undertaken great effort to keep exclusive possession of, and access to, the Mouse Model.

55. As alleged above, Defendants have wrongfully asserted their ownership over, and have wrongfully and unlawfully used and exploited for their own personal gain, the Mouse Model, as well as derivatives and progeny. and have unlawfully interfered with same.

56. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000.

**AS AND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
(Conversion of Progeny of Mouse Model)

57. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

58. Plaintiff is the owner and has the immediate right to possession of the progeny of the Mouse Model.

59. Upon information and belief, Gogos has possession of progeny of the Mouse Model.

60. Upon information and belief, Gogos took possession of the progeny of the Mouse Model with the authorization and consent of Columbia.

61. In addition, Columbia has asserted ownership over Plaintiff's intellectual property.

62. Despite demand, Gogos, and Columbia, have refused to return the progeny of the Mouse Model in Gogos' possession.

63. Such possession and use by Defendants is in derogation and interference with Plaintiff's right to exclusive possession.

64. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000.

**AS AND FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

(Unjust Enrichments)

65. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

66. Plaintiff is the owner of the Mouse Model, all progeny and derivatives thereof.

67. Plaintiff expended great time, effort and funds to develop the Mouse Model, lending her name, professional reputation and credibility with the Mouse Model, all of which provided significant value to the Mouse Model.

68. Defendants have improperly and without authorization claimed ownership of the Mouse Model (and its progeny and derivatives), and have without authorization used the Mouse Model, and have greatly benefited thereby.

69. As a result, it would be against equity and good conscience to permit Defendants to retain the benefit of such improper and unlawful use.

70. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000.

**AS AND FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

(Permanent Injunction)

71. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the above paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

72. As alleged above, Plaintiff is the owner of the Mouse Model, all progeny and derivatives thereof.

73. Plaintiff never assigned any rights in the Mouse Model, all progeny and derivatives thereof to Columbia or Gogos.

74. Columbia and Gogos have no rights, ownership or otherwise, to use, transfer or exploit in any manner the Mouse Model, all progeny and derivatives thereof.

75. Defendants have purported to assert ownership rights in the Mouse Model by making public statements regarding same, and have taken possession and unlawfully used and have attempted to transfer the Mouse Model.

76. Further, upon information and belief, Columbia has attempted to, or did agree, to license the Mouse Model to a third-party without the consent or authorization of Plaintiff.

77. Plaintiff would be irreparably harmed if Defendants are permitted to engage in the aforementioned conduct.

78. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction, permanently restraining and enjoining Defendants, and their agents, employees, or anyone else acting at their direction or control, from: (1) claiming any ownership of the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof; (2) transferring, assigning, selling, or conveying any rights in the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof; and (3) using in any way the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof without Plaintiff's express written consent.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment as follows:

- (a) On the First Cause of Action, a declaration declaring that: (i) Plaintiff is the sole and exclusive owner of the Mouse Model; and (ii) neither Columbia, nor Gogos, have any ownership interest in the Mouse Model, its progeny or derivatives, or in any of the intellectual property that may be generated by using and analyzing the Mouse Model.

- (b) On the Second Cause of Action, in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants Columbia and Gogos, jointly and severally, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000, together with interest thereon;
- (c) On the Third Cause of Action, in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants Columbia and Gogos, jointly and severally, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000, together with interest thereon;
- (d) On the Fourth Cause of Action, in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants Columbia and Gogos, jointly and severally, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than \$1,000,000, together with interest thereon;
- (e) On the Fifth Cause of Action, permanently restraining and enjoining Defendants Columbia and Gogos, and their agents, employees, or anyone else acting at their direction or control, from: (i) claiming any ownership of the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof; (ii) transferring, assigning, selling, or conveying any rights in the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof; and (iii) using in any way the Mouse Model, any of its progeny and derivatives thereof without Plaintiff's express written consent.
- (f) For her costs and disbursements in this action, including her reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- (g) For such other and further relief as the Court deems just, equitable and proper.

Dated: New York, New York  
 January 31, 2019

CARMEL, MILAZZO & DiCHIARA LLP

By: /s/  
 Christopher P. Milazzo

Mike 1/31/2019 11:49 PM  
 Deleted: \_\_

Mike 1/31/2019 11:50 PM  
 Deleted: \_\_

55 West 39<sup>th</sup> Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 658-0458

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*