Akkoc v 12-14 E. 37th Dev. Corp.

2013 NY Slip Op 32655(U)

September 19, 2013

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 107610/2005

Judge: Lucy Billings

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(U), are republished from various state and local government websites. These include the New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service, and the Bronx County Clerk's office.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

(ANNED]N 10/25/2013

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

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

		Justice		PART 4	<u>u</u>
Index Number : 107610/20	205	Justica			
AKKOC, NURI M.	,			INDEX NO.	
VS.				MOTION DATE	
12-14 E. 37TH DEVELOP! SEQUENCE NUMBER: 0				MOTION SEQ. NO.	
DISMISS	,			MOTION SEQ. NO.	*
and the second s		·			
The following papers, number		•	dismiss the	•	2
Notice of Motion/Order to Sho				No(s)	
Answering Affidavits — Exhib				No(s)	
Upon the foregoing papers, The war grants set firth in the ac				No(s)	2
•					
			e.		
				LED	
				LED	
				LED 7 25 2013	
			No.	7 25 2013	ICE
			OC	7 25 2013 TI FRK'S OFF	ICE
			OC	7 25 2013	ICE
Dated: 9 19 13			COUNTY (7 25 2013 TI FRK'S OFF	ı s
Dated: 9 19 13			COUNTY ONE	7 25 2013 CLERK'S OFF EW YORK	l S, J.S
Dated: 9 19 13	_	CASE DISPOSED	COUNTY ONE	7 25 2013 CLERK'S OFF EW YORK) S, J.S
			COUNTY ONE	7 25 2013 CLERK'S OFF EW YORK	S, J.S

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

NURI M. AKKOC,

Index No. 107610/2005

Plaintiff

-against-

DECISION AND ORDER

12-14 E. 37TH DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

Defendant

----x

12-14 E. 37TH DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

Third Party Plaintiff

-against-

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC., F.J. SCIAME CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., and LUCKY DELI, INC.,

Third Party Defendants

FILED

OCT 25 2013

COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE NEW YORK

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.:

The remaining defendant, 12-14 E. 37th Development Corp., moves to dismiss the complaint pursuant to C.P.L.R. §§ 1021 and 3126(3). Defendant bases its motion on plaintiff's failure to respond to defendant's disclosure requests served in December 2011 and the failure by plaintiff's attorneys to attempt to contact their client to respond to the requests and thus learn of his death as of March 2011, to notify all other parties of his death, and to move to substitute the administratrix of his estate as plaintiff. Defendant, however, fails to show either that it ever served its disclosure requests on plaintiff's attorneys at

their current address as of when defendant first appeared in this action in 2010 or that the July 2012 preliminary conference or Preliminary Conference Order specifically referred to those requests, so as to prompt an inquiry by plaintiff's attorneys.

Although defendant's attorney insists that at an April 3013 status conference plaintiff's attorney orally agreed to respond to defendant's disclosure requests within 30 days, plaintiff's attorney denies any such agreement, as he had no knowledge of the requests at that point. Since the claimed agreement was neither in writing nor on the record, such an agreement would be unenforceable in any event. C.P.L.R. § 2104. Even had such a stipulation been binding under C.P.L.R. § 2104, it would have been of uncertain effect, as plaintiff's attorney at that point did know that he was without a client to represent.

Plaintiff's attorneys may have been justified in protecting their client's judgment by appealing in April 2011 the order vacating the default judgment and by moving in January 2012 to reargue defendant's motion to vacate the default judgment without attempting to consult their client. The attorneys were not justified, however, in appearing for a settlement conference in September 2012 without having attempted to consult their client. They do not show that they had consulted him before his death regarding a minimum amount that he would accept. Although defendant's offer at that conference was minimal, perhaps justifying rejection without an attempt to contact plaintiff, his attorneys did not know that the offer would be so low before the

2

appearance. As a result of their failures to attempt to contact plaintiff, his attorneys have wasted the parties' time at that appearance and the subsequent appearance for a compliance conference in September 2012. The record reveals no attempt by plaintiff's attorneys to contact their client even as the November 2012 deadline for depositions approached.

After plaintiff's attorneys in February 2013 learned of plaintiff's death, they attempted to obtain the parties' stipulation to substitute the administratrix of his estate as plaintiff, so that the status conferences scheduled in April and June 2013 might proceed productively. Defendant fails to show that it rejected these attempts until the June 2013 conference. Since then, however, plaintiff's attorneys have unnecessarily delayed in moving to substitute the administratrix of plaintiff's estate as plaintiff.

Consequently, the court grants defendant's motion to the extent of ordering dismissal of the complaint if plaintiff's attorneys further fail to move to substitute the administratrix of plaintiff's estate as plaintiff by September 30, 2013.

C.P.L.R. § 1021. The court also imposes costs in the form of attorneys' fees awarded to defendant of \$1,000.00, to be paid to defendant by plaintiff's attorneys, for the two court appearances in September 2013. C.P.L.R. § 3126. If plaintiff's attorneys fail to pay defendant within 30 days after service of this order

[* 5]

with notice of entry, defendant may enter a judgment against them for that amount.

DATED: September 19, 2013

Lung Mungs

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.

LUCY BILLINGS J.S.C.

FILED

OCT 25 2013

COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE NEW YORK