

**Strujan v State Farm Ins.**

2012 NY Slip Op 31799(U)

July 3, 2012

Sup Ct, New York County

Docket Number: 400526/2011

Judge: Judith J. Gische

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

HON. JUDITH J. GISCHE

PRESENT: \_\_\_\_\_  
Justice

PART 10

Index Number : 400526/2011  
STRUJAN, ELENA  
vs.  
STATE FARM INSURANCES  
SEQUENCE NUMBER : 002  
COMPEL DISCLOSURE

INDEX NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
MOTION DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
MOTION SEQ. NO. 002

The following papers, numbered 1 to \_\_\_\_\_, were read on this motion to/for \_\_\_\_\_

Notice of Motion/Order to Show Cause — Affidavits — Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
Answering Affidavits — Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
Replying Affidavits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this motion is

**MOTION IS DECIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
THE ACCOMPANYING MEMORANDUM DECISION.**

*I shall file Note of Issue  
on or before August 3, 2012  
Case ready for trial*

**FILED**

JUL 10 2012

JUL 03 2012

Dated: July 3, 2012

NEW YORK  
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JUDITH J. GISCHE  
J.S.C.

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

- 1. CHECK ONE: .....  CASE DISPOSED  NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
- 2. CHECK AS APPROPRIATE: ..... MOTION IS:  GRANTED  DENIED  GRANTED IN PART  OTHER
- 3. CHECK IF APPROPRIATE: .....  SETTLE ORDER  SUBMIT ORDER
- DO NOT POST  FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT  REFERENCE

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK: IAS PART 10**

-----X

Elena Strujan,  
Plaintiff (s),

**-against-**

State Farm Insurances,  
John/Jane Doe,  
Defendant (s).

-----X

**DECISION/ ORDER**  
Index No.: 400526/2011  
Seq. No.: 002,003

**PRESENT:**  
Hon. Judith J. Gische  
JSC

Recitation, as required by CPLR § 2219 [a] of the papers considered in the review of this (these) motion(s):

<b>Papers</b>	<b>Numbered</b>
<u>Motion Sequence # 002</u>	
Notice of Motion, EJ affd., exhibits.....	1
BLB affirm., exhibits.....	2
"Plaiintiff's Reply and Complaint", exhibits.....	3
"Plaintiff's Reply Affidavit at Defendant's Objections to Compel with Discovery," exhibit.....	4
<u>Motion Sequence # 003</u>	
Notice of Motion, EJ affd., exhibits.....	1
BLB affirm. In Opp.....	2

**FILED**

**JUL 10 2012**

**NEW YORK  
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE**

*Upon the foregoing papers, the decision and order of the court is as follows:*

Plaintiff, pro se, brought this action against defendant alleging that it improperly failed to pay out on claims she made against an insurance policy it issued to her. By decision and order dated October 4, 2011, this court dismissed all claims made by plaintiff, except those relating to breach of contract. Discovery on the remaining claim proceeded. Plaintiff now brings two motions. Motion Sequence # 002 seeks to compel defendant to answer her demand for a bill of particulars. Motion Sequence # 003 seeks

an "order of protection." The motions are consolidated for determination in this single decision and order.

**DISCUSSION**

Discovery

Plaintiff claims that she served a Demand for a Bill of Particulars ("demand"), dated December 22, 2011, that defendant never responded to and that she needs the information requested to prosecute her case. In fact, the demand was responded to on January 26, 2011. Defendant's response raised legitimate objections to the demand, including that it was unauthorized because plaintiff had also served requests for answers to interrogatories and the demand improperly sought the production of documents. Notwithstanding the properly interposed objections, defendant, nevertheless, produced the requested documentation, except that which it otherwise claimed was privileged.

The requested documentation for which no privilege was asserted, and a privilege log, identifying the documents withheld on a claim of privilege, were produced to plaintiff under two cover letters, respectively dated February 3 and 6, 2012. In her reply, plaintiff does not dispute that she received the documentation. Instead, she now claims that the documents she received are false. Notwithstanding her claims, it is not apparent from the face of the copies of the documents that she provides on this motion that they are false. Plaintiff may reserve and attempt to prove this issue at trial, if the documents are otherwise admissible in evidence.

The motion to compel defendant to respond to the demand for a bill of particulars is, therefore, denied.

Motion for an Order of Protection

While at first blush it seems as though plaintiff is seeking further relief regarding discovery, in fact she is really seeking a criminal order of protection. She claims that defendant continues to "harass [her], to stole (sic) evidences, [and] delete files from computer." This is, in part, a rehash of claims she made in her earlier motion (Seq # 001) that were rejected by the court in its October 4, 2011 decision and order because plaintiff had failed to provide any proof of her sweeping accusations. No additional proof is provided in this motion of that alleged behavior.

There are new claims made by plaintiff in this motion, including that defendant stole evidence and deleted her computer files. There is no evidence supporting these bold and serious accusations other than plaintiff's statement, that files she personally controlled are now missing. She also admits that in a landlord tenant matter, with other attorneys, she also had issues with missing files. There is no evidence tying defendant to her missing documents other than personal suspicion.

There is no legal basis for issuing an order of protection. These parties are not related, so that there can be no family offenses that support the relief sought. DRL §240. Nor is there a pending criminal proceeding that would warrant protecting plaintiff as the victim of a crime. CPL ¶530.13. Also lacking is any indicia of criminal behavior that would warrant such drastic relief. Plaintiff's bare-boned allegations are insufficient proof.

The motion for an Order of Protection is, therefore, denied as well.

**Conclusion**

In accordance herewith, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion (Sequence # 002) for an order compelling discovery is denied, and it is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion (Sequence # 003) for and Order of Protection is denied, and it is further

ORDERED that this matter is certified for trial, plaintiff is directed to file a Note of issue on or before August 3, 2012 and it is further

ORDERED that any requested relief not otherwise expressly granted herein is denied and that this constitutes the decision and order of the court.

Dated: New York, New York  
July 3, 2012

SO ORDERED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J.G. J.S.C.

**FILED**

JUL 10 2012

NEW YORK  
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE