Tini v Alliancebernstein L.P.			
2012 NY Slip Op 31670(U)			
June 14, 2012			
Supreme Court, New York County			
Docket Number: 100244/2012			
Judge: Lucy Billings			
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.

MOTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY REFERRED TO JUSTICE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

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

LU	CY BILLINGS	
PRESENT:	J.S.C.	PART 46
	Justice	
Index Number : 100244/2012		
TINI, JAY D.		INDEX NO.
vs. ALLIANCEBERNSTEIN L.P.		MOTION DATE
SEQUENCE NUMBER : 001 DISMISS	·	MOTION SEQ. NO
The following papers, numbered 1 to	3, were read on this motion to fight	iss the complaint
Notice of Motion/Order to Show Caus	se — Affidavits — Exhibits	No(s). 1-2
Answering Affidavits — Exhibits		_
Replying Affidavits		No(e)
Upon the foregoing papers, it is o	rdered that this metion is ;	
tu court devies def	cultants' motion to desmiss the co	uplaint musupent to the
CHI AND AND WAS ARE ACADA	Culaus' motion to dubuiss the Co C.P.L.K. § 3211(a)(1) and (7).	1 1 2 2 , .
Variable of the same of		
	· ·	FILED
	-	
		JUN 22 2012
	COU	NEW YORK NTY CLERK'S OFFICE
Dated: 4/14/12		Luy Both 95 J.S.C.
		LUCY BILLINGS
HECK ONE:	CASE DISPOSED	$\mathcal{LS}.$
HECK AS APPROPRIATE:	MOTION IS: GRANTED DENIED	GRANTED IN PART OTHER
HECK IF APPROPRIATE:	SETTLE ORDER	SUBMIT ORDER
	□DO NOT POST □ FIDU	CIARY APPOINTMENT REFERENCE

[* 2]

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK: PART 46

----x

JAY D. TINI,

Index No. 100204/2012

Plaintiff

- against -

<u>DECISION AND ORDER</u>

ALLIANCEBERNSTEIN L.P. and ALLIANCEBERNSTEIN HOLDING, L.P.

Defendants

FILED

----x

JUN 22 2012

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.:

I. THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

The Century Club Plan Award Agreement ¶ 3 and the Incentive Compensation Award Program and 2010 Long Term Incentive Plan - 2010 Award Agreement ¶ 3, both between plaintiff and defendants, dated December 10, 2010, and incorporated in the Verified Complaint, provide as follows. First, plaintiff, defendant AllianceBernstein L.P.'s former employee, and referred to as "the Participant":

shall provide the Partnership with prior written notice of the Participant's intent to terminate employment with the partnership The notice period shall be . . . 60 days.

Aff. of Joseph Baumgarten Ex. 1, Schedule A, and Ex. 2. Second, plaintiff:

will continue to be eligible for base compensation (salary and/or commissions) and benefits during the notice period provided that the Partnership may, in its sole discretion, require the Participant to discontinue regular duties, including prohibiting the Participant from further entry to any of the Partnership's premises.

Ιd.

tini.139

The parties do not dispute that plaintiff provided defendant partnership written notice October 12, 2011, of his intent to terminate employment with the partnership Friday, December 9, 2011. Paragraph 3 of the agreements, particularly when construed against AllianceBernstein L.P., the undisputed drafter, is susceptible of the interpretation that plaintiff was entitled to his salary, commissions, and any benefits that would vest through December 9, 2011. Cowen_& Co. v. Anderson, 76 N.Y.2d 318, 323 (1990); <u>Jacobson v. Sassower</u>, 66 N.Y.2d 991, 993 (1985); <u>Arbeeny</u> v. Kennedy Exec. Search, Inc., 71 A.D.3d 177, 182 (1st Dep't 2010); Burgos v. Metro-North Commuter R.R., 40 A.D.3d 377, 378 (1st Dep't 2007). Defendants, in addition to being entitled to the advance notice of 60 days, in turn were entitled to limit or eliminate plaintiff's duties in the event defendants found his services or presence undesirable, while plaintiff remained subject to his obligations of undivided loyalty and noncompetition as an employee.

Nothing in the agreements permitted defendant to reduce the notice period of 60 days as they did. Although both defendants and plaintiff were entitled to terminate his employment at any time for any reason, and defendants were not obligated to provide any advance notice, once plaintiff met his unilateral obligation to provide the notice required of him, ¶ 3, specifically applicable in that event, governed defendants' ensuing obligation. Israel v. Chabra, 12 N.Y.3d 158, 168 n.3 (2009); SportsChannel Assoc, v. Sterling Mets, L.P., 25 A.D.3d 314 (1st

Dep't 2006); Chemical Bank v. Stahl, 233 A.D.2d 460, 461 (1st Dep't 1996).

Paragraph 7 of the Century Club Plan Award Agreement and the identical ¶ 6 of the Incentive Compensation Award Program and 2010 Long Term Incentive Plan - 2010 Award Agreement, on which defendants rely, provide that plaintiff's right to the vesting of benefits on future dates:

shall not confer on the Participant any right to continue in the employ of the Partnership and shall not in any way interfere with the right of the Partnership to terminate the service of the Participant at any time for any reason.

<u>Id.</u> This paragraph of the agreements, again when construed against the drafter, is susceptible of the interpretation that first, before plaintiff provided notice of his resignation, his right to the vesting of benefits on future dates did not limit defendants from terminating his employment immediately. Second, after he provided notice of his resignation, his right to the vesting of benefits after that resignation 60 days later did not. confer a right to continued employment until future vesting dates after the 60 days.

II. DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT

tini.139

Plaintiff's breach of contract claims for salary, commissions, and benefits due plaintiff through December 9, 2011, thus survive dismissal. As his salary and commissions, at minimum, constitute wages under New York Labor Law § 190, his claims under Labor Law § 198 also survive. Therefore the court denies defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint based on documentary evidence and failure to state a claim. C.P.L.R. § 3

[* 5]

3211(a)(1) and (7). Defendants shall answer the complaint consistent with C.P.L.R. § 3211(f). This decision constitutes the court's order.

DATED: June 14, 2012

Lyng rollings

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.

LUCY BILLINGS

FILED

JUN 22 2012

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE