Gjonbalaj v 317 W. 89th St. LLC	
2011 NY Slip Op 33411(U)	
November 30, 2011	
Supreme Court, New York County	
Docket Number: 109920/2008	
Judge: Saliann Scarpulla	
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.	

PRESENT: Salann Scarpu	UQ PART <u>19</u>
Index Number : 109920/2008	
GJONBALAJ, ALI	MOTION DATE
317 WEST 89TH STREET	
SEQUENCE NUMBER : 006	MOTION CAL. NO
SUBPOENA DUCES LECOM) this motion to/for
	PAPERS NUMBERED
Notice of Motion/ Order to Show Cause - Affid	avits — Exhibits
Answering Affidavits — Exhibits	
Replying Affidavits	·
Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this	s motion
	n decision dated $\frac{11/20}{20}$
decided per the memorandum	n decision dated $\frac{11/20}{20}$
decided per the memorandum	n decision dated $\frac{11}{30}$
decided per the memorandum	n decision dated <u>11/30/2011</u> quence(s) no. FILED
decided per the memorandum	n decision dated $\frac{11/30/2011}{200}$ juence(s) no. FILED DEC 16 2011 NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
decided per the memorandum which disposes of motion seq	n decision dated 11/30/2011 Juence(s) no. FILED DEC 16 2011 NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
decided per the memorandum which disposes of motion seq Dated: $11/30/14$	n decision dated $\frac{11}{30} \frac{1}{20} \frac{1}{20} \frac{1}{20} \frac{1}{10}$ Jee 16 2011 Dec 16 2011 NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE MALIANN SCARPULLA ^{S.C.} NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK: IAS PART 19

-----X

ALI GJONBALAJ, as Administrator of the Estate of ALEN GJONBALAJ deceased,

Plaintiffs,

Index No.: 109920/2008

-against-

21

THE 317 WEST 89TH STREET LLC C/O SAMSON MANAGEMENT CONDOMINIUM, THE 317 WEST 89TH CONDOMINIUM AND FOUR STAR GENERAL CLEANING CORP.

Defendants.

-----X 317 WEST 89TH STREET LLC, C/O SAMSON MANAGEMENT AND THE 317 WEST 89TH STREET CONDOMINIUM,

Third-Party Plaintiffs,

DECISION AND ORDER

FILED

DEC 16 2011

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

Index No.: 590421/2009

-against-

FOUR STAR GENERAL CLEANING CORP.

Third Party Defendants.

-----X

For Plaintiff: Daniel Davidovic, Esq. 2509 Avenue U Brooklyn, NY 11229 For Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs 317 West 89th LLC C/O Samson Management and the 317 W 89th Street Condomium Malapero & Prisco LLP 295 Madison Ave. New York, NY 10017

Papers considered in review of this motion to dismiss:

Notice of Motion1
Aff in Support
Aff in Opposition

1

HON. SALIANN SCARPULLA, J.:

In this action to recover damages for personal injuries and wrongful death, plaintiff Ali Gjonbalaj, as Administrator of the Estate of Alen Gjonbalaj, deceased ("plaintiff"), moves for an issuance of subpoenas on non-parties Erik Eastbrook ("Eastbrook") of the New York City Police Department (NYPD) and Aaron Rosen, M.D. ("Rosen"), of the Office of Chief Medical Examiner for the City of New York.

On July 28, 2007, Alen Gjombalaj ("Gjombalaj") was allegedly murdered in his apartment located in the 317 West 89th Street condominium. Gjombalaj was the condominium's superintendant. Ali Gjonbalaj, the Administrator of his estate, commenced this action in July 2008, alleging that defendants negligently operated, maintained and controlled the building, thus permitting an unidentified intruder to gain access to the apartment.

Plaintiff now moves for an issuance of subpoenas on non-parties Eastbrook and Rosen. On August 17, 2011, plaintiffs withdrew their motion as to Rosen. However, they still seek Easterbrook's deposition, as well as documents from Easterbook relating to the Gjombalaj murder investigation. Plaintiff asserts that Easterbrook could testify to the condition of the situs of the accident at the time he entered the apartment.

2

In opposition, defendants 317 West 89th Street LLC and 317 West 89th Street LLCc/o Samson Management ("defendants") argue that the Court should deny plaintiff's motion because the proposed subpoenas are facially defective for failing to explain why the discovery from Eastbrook is necessary. Defendants further argue that plaintiffs have not established adequate special circumstances to require the deposition and production of documents from Easterbrook. Defendants also maintain that the requested disclosure would impair the criminal investigation into Gjombalaj's murder.

Discussion

4]

Disclosure may be sought from a non-party "upon notice stating the circumstances or reasons such disclosure is sought or required." CPLR § 3101(a)(4). Further, there must be "adequate special circumstances" to support the disclosure. *Brady v. Ottaway Newspapers, Inc.*, 63 N.Y.2d 1031, 1032 (1984). "Whether or not adequate special circumstances have been shown to support discovery against a nonparty is generally a determination to be made upon a review of the facts, and rests within the sound discretion of the court to which application is made." *Brady*, 63 N.Y.2d at 1032.

Here, plaintiff has not articulated adequate special circumstances to support discovery from non-party Easterbrook. Plaintiff does not indicate that it has made any efforts to obtain the information from another source, nor has plaintiff asserted that attempting to do so would be fruitless. *See Cirale v. 80 Pine Street Corp.*, 35 N.Y.2d 113, 114 (1974) (holding that a wrongful death plaintiff did not show adequate special circumstances to support non-party discovery-from a government agency where plaintiff did not "indicate what endeavors, if any, were undertaken to obtain" independent evidence).¹

In accordance with the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the motion seeking a subpoena and a subponeas duces tecum by plaintiff Ali Gjonbalaj, as Administrator of the Estate of Alen Gjonbalaj, deceased, is denied.

This constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

Dated: New York, New York November 30, 2011

[* 5]

ENTER:

carpulle-

FILED

DEC 16 2011

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

¹Because plaintiffs have not articulated adequate special circumstances to warrant discovery from Easterbrook, this Court does not decide whether the subpoenas are facially defective or whether the information seeking discovery from Easterbrook would impair an ongoing criminal investigation.