Ocean	Pacific	Interiors,	. Inc. v	Farber

2014 NY Slip Op 30387(U)

February 7, 2014

Sup Ct, New York County

Docket Number: 113911/2011

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.

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

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

PRESENT:	LUCYD	ALLINGS J.C.C.		PART 44
		Justice	_	
ladas Nortas de 140044	10044		INDEX NO.	
Index Number: 113911 OCEAN PACIFIC INTE			MOTION DATE	
FARBER, M.D., PLLC,		: · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	MOTION SEQ. NO	
SEQUENCE NUMBER PARTIAL SUMMARY JUD		. !	MOTION CAL. NO.	•
The following papers,	numbered 1 to <u>5</u>	were read on	this motion 16/for 1	artal summany
			1	PAPERS NUMBERED
Notice of Motion/ Orde	er to Show Cause -	– Affidavits – Exl	nibits	1-3
Answering Affidavits -	- Exhibits			4
Replying Affidavits				5
Jpon the foregoing parties that Court Du The Court Du Defendants excep	pers, it is ordered t mes plantiffs pt 100 Church	that this motion: Mation for Fee Owner, L	Enmuay judgu LC, pursuant	uent against all to the alcompa
Upon the foregoing parties that Court du defendants excepted deusson. C.P. L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	that this motion: Mation for Fee Owner, L	<u> </u>	uent against al to the accompan
Upon the foregoing parties that COUNT BU defendants excep decision. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 (hwch .K. § 3212(b).	' mation for Fee Owner, L	ED	uent against al to the accompa
The court du The court du defendants excep decision. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	ree Owner, L	ED 2014 DRK	uent against al to the accompa
The court du The court du defendants excep decision. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	FEB 13	ED 2014 DRK	nent against al to the accompan
The court du The court du defendants excep deusion. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	FEB 13	ED 2014 DRK	vent against al
The court dust defendants excepteusion. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES Plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	FEB 13	ED 2014 DRK	nent against al
The court du defendants excep decision. C.P.L	pers, it is ordered t MES plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	FEB 13	ED 2014 DRK	vent against al
Upon the foregoing parties of the Court dus defendants excepted deutsion. C.P.L.	pers, it is ordered t MES Plantiffs pt 100 Church .K. § 3212(b).	FEB 13	ED 2014 DRK	J s

Check if appropriate:

DO NOT POST

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

OCEAN PACIFIC INTERIORS, INC., and Index No. 113911/2011 PRISTINE MAINTENANCE, INC.,

Plaintiffs

- against -

DECISION AND ORDER

LEONARD A. FARBER, M.D., PLLC, LEONARD A. FARBER, M.D., TANYA TOHILL FARBER, MARNEE SPIERER, M.D., and 100 CHURCH FEE OWNER, LLC,

FILED

Defendants

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.:

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sue defendants for nonpayment of the agreed costs of construction and renovations plaintiffs performed pursuant to contract for Leonard A. Farber, M.D., PLLC (the Farber Center), on its premises, which were leased from defendant 100 Church Fee Owner, LLC. The Farber Center executed a promissory note to cover the costs, which defendants Leonard A. Farber, M.D., his wife Tanya Tohill Farber, and Marnee Spierer, M.D., personally guaranteed. Plaintiffs move for summary judgment on their claim against the Farber Center for breach of the promissory note and their claim against the Farber defendants and Spierer for breach of the guaranty. C.P.L.R. § 3212(b). For the reasons explained below, the court denies plaintiffs' motion.

II. SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARDS

To obtain summary judgment, plaintiffs must make a prima facie showing of entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, through admissible evidence eliminating all material issues of fact. C.P.L.R. § 3212(b); Veqa v. Restani Constr. Corp., 18 N.Y.3d 499, 503 (2012); Smalls v. AJI Indus., Inc., 10 N.Y.3d 733, 735 (2008); JMD Holding Corp. v. Congress Fin. Corp., 4 N.Y.3d 373, 384 (2005); Giuffrida v. Citibank Corp., 100 N.Y.2d 72, 81 (2003). If plaintiffs satisfy this standard, the burden shifts to defendants to rebut that prima facie showing, by producing evidence, in admissible form, sufficient to require a trial of material factual issues. Morales v. D & A Food Serv., 10 N.Y.3d 911, 913 (2008); Hyman v. Queens County Bancorp, Inc., 3 N.Y.3d 743, 744 (2004). In evaluating the evidence for purposes of the plaintiffs' motion, the court construes the evidence in the light most favorable to defendants. Vega v. Restani Constr. Corp., 18 N.Y.3d at 503; Cahill v. Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Auth., 4 N.Y.3d 35, 37 (2004). If plaintiffs fail to meet their initial burden, the court must deny summary judgment despite any insufficiency in defendants' opposition. Vega v. Restani Constr. Corp., 18 N.Y.3d at 503; JMD Holding Corp. v. Congress Fin. Corp., 4 N.Y.3d at 384.

III. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS

A. The Stay Imposed by Defendants' Bankruptcy Petitions
Since the Farber Center filed a petition for bankruptcy
March 15, 2013, and Spierer filed a petition for bankruptcy

* 4]

January 10, 2014, those proceedings automatically stay this action against those two defendants. 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1); Education Resources Inst., Inc. v. Concannon, 69 A.D.3d 539, 540 (1st Dep't 2010); Levant v. National Car Rental, Inc., 33 A.D.3d 367, 368 (1st Dep't 2006). Since the stay does not extend to the Farbers, as nondebtor guarantors, the court decides plaintiffs' motion only against these defendants. Empire Erectors & Elec. Co., Inc. v. Unlimited Locations LLC, 102 A.D.3d 419 (1st Dep't 2013); Milliken & Co. v. Stewart, 182 A.D.2d 385, 386 (1st Dep't 1992).

B. Breach of the Guaranty

To demonstrate entitlement to recover on a personal guaranty, plaintiffs must present evidence of the guaranty, the amount of the debt guaranteed, and defendants' default. Carrera Casting Corp. v. Cord, 106 A.D.3d 422 (1st Dep't 2013); Acadia Woods Partners, LLC v. Signal Lake Fund LP, 102 A.D.3d 522, 523 (1st Dep't 2013); Gard Entertainment, Inc. v. Country in N.Y., LLC, 96 A.D.3d 683 (1st Dep't 2012). See Traders Co. v. AST Sportswear, Inc., 31 A.D.3d 276, 277 (1st Dep't 2006). Plaintiffs support their motion with the affidavit of Oliver Papraniku, the president of both Ocean Pacific Interiors and Pristine Maintenance, who attests that Pristine Maintenance's subcontractor, Ocean Pacific Interiors, performed construction work at the Farber Center. When the Farber Center needed more time to pay for the construction work, the Farber Center executed a promissory note November 1, 2010, which the Farbers and Spierer

guaranteed by executing a personal guaranty. Although the Farber Center paid the first three \$50,000.00 installments, it failed to remit the payment due October 1, 2011.

Papraniku does not authenticate the personal guaranty that the Farbers signed. While the signature of Vivian Colon, designated as a witness, appears on the guaranty, plaintiffs do not present her or any other witness' affidavit attesting to the Farbers' signatures on the quaranty or any other evidence authenticating the guaranty. Plaintiffs therefore fail to establish a prima facie breach of the guaranty. IRB-Brasil Resseguros S.A. v. Portobello Intl. Ltd., 84 A.D.3d 637, 638 (1st Dep't 2011); Rivera v. GT Acquisition 1 Corp., 72 A.D.3d 525, 526 (1st Dep't 2010); Babikian v. Nikki Midtown, LLC, 60 A.D.3d 470, 471 (1st Dep't 2009); Bermudez v. Ruiz, 185 A.D.2d 212, 214 (1st Dep't 1992). See Singer Asset Fin. Co., LLC v. Melvin, 33 A.D.3d 355, 357-58 (1st Dep't 2006); Acevedo v. Audubon Mqt., 280 A.D.2d 91, 95 (1st Dep't 2001); People v. Bryant, 12 A.D.3d 1077, 1079 (4th Dep't 2004); Fields v. S & W Realty Assoc., 301 A.D.2d 625 (2d Dep't 2003). Plaintiffs' failure to support their summary judgment motion with admissible evidence requires denial of the motion. Suppiah v. Kalish, 76 A.D.3d 829, 832-33 (1st Dep't 2010); Galindo v. Dorchester Tower Condominium, 56 A.D.3d 285, 286 (1st Dep't 2008); <u>Dorsey v. Les Sans Culottes</u>, 43 A.D.3d 261 (1st Dep't 2007). See IRB-Brasil Ressequros S.A. v. Eldorado Trading Corp. Ltd., 68 A.D.3d 576, 577 (1st Dep't 2009).

CONCLUSION

IV.

In light of the automatic stay, the court denies plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment against defendants Leonard A. Farber, M.D., PLLC, and Spierer, without prejudice to a future timely motion after the bankruptcy court lifts the stay. C.P.L.R. § 3212(a). See Jackson v. Rockefeller Ctr. Props., 290 A.D.2d 315 (1st Dep't 2002); Capital One, N.A. v. Waterfront Realty II, LLC, 94 A.D.3d 683, 684 (2d Dep't 2012). On the merits of plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on their claim of breach of a guaranty against defendants Leonard A. Farber, M.D., and Tanya Tohill Farber, the court denies the motion. C.P.L.R. § 3212(b). This decision constitutes the court's order.

DATED: February 7, 2014

my Sillards

LUCY BILLINGS, J.S.C.

FILED

FEB 13 2014

NEW YORK
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE