Garcia v 145 Edwards LLC
2012 NY Slip Op 30401(U)
February 15, 2012
Sup Ct, NY County
Docket Number: 105164/10
Judge: Barbara Jaffe
Republished from New York State Unified Court
System's E-Courts Service.
Search E-Courts (http://www.nycourts.gov/ecourts) for
any additional information on this case.
This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official
publication.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT:	AFFE PART 5
Index Number : 105164/2010 GARCIA, CAROL vs. 145 EDWARDS SEQUENCE NUMBER : 001 COMPEL	INDEX NO MOTION DATE MOTION SEQ. NO
The following papers, numbered 1 to, were read on thi Notice of Motion/Order to Show Cause — Affidavits — Exhibit Answering Affidavits — Exhibits Replying Affidavits Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this motion	ts No(s). <u>2</u> No(s). <u>3</u> No(s)
	· · ·

MOTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY REFERRED TO JUSTICE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):	ACCOMPANYIN	CORDANCE WITH IG DECISION / ORDER	
MOTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY I FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):			FILED FEB 23 2012
MOTION	Dated: 2-17/12 FEB 1 7 2012		NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
1. 0	CHECK ONE:		BARBARA JAFFE
2. 0	CHECK AS APPROPRIATE:MOTION IS	: 🗌 GRANTED 🛛 🗌 DENIED	GRANTED IN PART
3. (CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		
		🗌 DO NOT POST 🛛 🗍 FIDU	

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK : PART 5

-----X

CAROL GARCIA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

145 EDWARDS LLC, MEMPHIS CANDY GROCERY CORP., and THE CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendants.

----X

BARBARA JAFFE, JSC:

For plaintiff: Igor Grichanik, Esq. Novo Law Firm, PC 299 Broadway, 17th Fl. New York, NY 10007 212-233-6686 Index No. 105164/10

Motion Subm.: 11/22/11 Motion Seq. No.: 001

DECISION & ORDER

FILED

FEB 23 2012

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE For 145 Edwards LLC: Paul J. Felicione, Esq. Desena & Sweeney, LLP 1383 Veterans Memorial Hwy. Ste. 32 Hauppauge, NY 11788 631-360-7333

. By notice of motion dated August 16, 2011, defendant 145 Edwards LLC (LLC) moves pursuant to CPLR 3126(3) for an order striking plaintiff's complaint for her failure to comply with discovery. Plaintiff opposes and, by notice of cross motion dated September 15, 2011, moves for an order protecting against disclosure of any records of substance abuse treatment she received. LLC opposes the cross motion. After oral argument, the parties resolved the motions except as to the issue of plaintiff's substance abuse records.

I. PERTINENT BACKGROUND AND CONTENTIONS

On January 19, 2010, plaintiff was injured when she allegedly tripped and fell on a defective portion of the sidewalk in front of defendants' premises. (Affirmation of Paul J. Felicione, Esq., dated Aug. 16, 2011 [Felicione Aff.], Exh. A). On or about April 13, 2011, LLC served plaintiff with a supplemental notice for discovery and inspection seeking, as pertinent

here, plaintiff's records and/or authorizations related to her various medical and mental health issues and treatment. (*Id.*, Exh. C).

3]

Plaintiff argues that records of treatment she received for alcohol and/or drug abuse are irrelevant absent any connection between her treatment or abuse and the injuries she sustained, and observes that there is no evidence that she was intoxicated on the day of her accident, nor has she denied that she was then receiving methadone treatment. She thus contends that such records are more prejudicial than probative. (Affirmation of Igor Grichanik, Esq., dated Sept. 15, 2011).

In reply, LLC maintains that plaintiff waived any objection to its demands as she failed to object or move for a protective order timely, and observes that plaintiff testified that she had received methadone treatment immediately before her accident. It contends that plaintiff's physical condition is at issue to the extent it affected her ability to walk and perceive conditions on the ground, and that her mental condition is at issue to the extent that she seeks to introduce evidence related to her condition and lifestyle before the accident. (Affirmation of Paul J. Felicione, Esq., dated Oct. 7, 2011).

II. ANALYSIS

CPLR 3101(a), which provides for full disclosure of all matters material and necessary in the prosecution or defense of an action, should be "interpreted liberally to require disclosure, upon request, of any facts bearing on the controversy which will assist preparation for trial by sharpening the issues and reducing delay and prolixity. The test is one of usefulness and reason." (*Allen v Crowell-Collier Pub. Co.*, 21 NY2d 403 [1968]). Thus, disclosure should be permitted if the information sought is relevant to the action. (Siegel, NY Prac § 344 [4th ed]). Pursuant to CPLR 3124, a party may move to compel disclosure from another party that has not responded or complied with any discovery request and, pursuant to CPLR 3126, if a party refuses to obey a court order to provide discovery, the court may preclude that party from submitting evidence at trial or strike its pleadings.

41

"It is well settled that a party must provide duly executed and acknowledged written authorizations for the release of pertinent medical records under the liberal discovery provisions of the CPLR ... when that party has waived the physician-patient privilege by affirmatively putting his or her physical or mental condition in issue." (*Cynthia B. v New Rochelle Hosp. Med. Ctr.*, 60 NY2d 452 [1983]).

Substance abuse treatment records are generally confidential and not subject to disclosure unless certain requirements are met. As a predicate for ordering the disclosure of such records, the court must find that the interests of justice significantly outweigh the need for confidentiality. (Mental Hygiene Law §§ 22.05, 33.13; *L.T. v Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.*, 71 AD3d 1400 [4th Dept 2010]).

Here, LLC does not demonstrate that plaintiff has placed her mental condition in issue by, for example, asserting a claim based on a loss of enjoyment of life. (*Compare Salazar v 521-533 W. 57th St. Condominium*, 84 AD3d 927 [2d Dept 2011] [mental health and substance abuse treatment records not discoverable as plaintiff withdrew claims for injuries related to those conditions], *with Azznara v Strauss*, 81 AD3d 578 [2d Dept 2011] [plaintiff's alcohol and drug abuse records material and necessary to damages for claim of loss of enjoyment of life]; *Coddington v Lisk*, 249 AD2d 817 [3d Dept 1998] [as plaintiff claimed loss of enjoyment of life and permanent damages, defendant entitled to records related to plaintiff's past drug addiction]).

LLC has thus failed to demonstrate plaintiff's entire treatment records are material and

3

[* 5]

necessary to its defense or that the interests of justice outweigh their confidentiality. (*See Wojtusiak v Elardo*, 43 AD3d 436 [2d Dept 2007] [plaintiff's drug treatment history not subject to disclosure as her mental health not in issue and it concerned illnesses and conditions unrelated to accident]).

However, to the extent that the methadone treatment plaintiff received immediately before her accident is relevant to her physical condition at the time of the accident, her treatment record for that day may contain relevant information which I will review *in camera* to ensure that only material and necessary information is disclosed need be.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED, that defendant 145 Edwards LLC's motion to strike is denied; and it is further

ORDERED, that plaintiff's cross motion for a protective order is granted except that plaintiff is directed to provide to defendant 145 Edwards LLC, within 30 days of the date of this order, HIPAA-compliant authorizations for the record of her methadone treatment on January 19, 2010, which shall be produced for an *in camera* inspection; the authorizations must direct that the records be sent to Justice Jaffe's chambers at 80 Centre Street, Room 307, New York, New York 10013.

ENTER:

Barbara Jaffe JSC BARBARA JA

FILED

FEB 23 2012

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATED: Februa New Y

February 15, 2012 New York, New York