Short Form Order

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT - QUEENS COUNTY

Present: **HONORABLE HOWARD G. LANE** **IAS PART 6**
Justice

----------	Index No. 10539/13
MD MOYAZZAM HOSSAIN,	
	Motion
Plaintiff,	Date July 27, 2015
-against-	Motion
	Cal. No. 51
JOSE GONZALEZ, et al.,	
	Motion
Defendants.	Sequence No. 3

	Papers Numbered
Notice of Motion-Affidavits-Exhibits...	1-5
Cross Motion.....	6-8
Opposition.....	9-11
Reply.....	12-15

Upon the foregoing papers it is ordered that this motion by defendants, Mohamed Abdelkader and King Car Taxi Inc. and cross motion by defendants, Fernando Padilla and Raul V. Padilla for summary judgment dismissing the complaint of plaintiff, MD Moyazzam Hossain, pursuant to CPLR 3212, on the ground that plaintiff has not sustained a serious injury within the meaning of the Insurance Law § 5102(d) are decided as follows:

This action arises out of an automobile accident that occurred on January 11, 2013. Moving defendants have submitted proof in admissible form in support of the motion for summary judgment, for all categories of serious injury. Moving defendants submitted inter alia, affirmed reports from three independent examining and/or evaluating physicians (a neurologist, an orthopedist and a radiologist) and plaintiff's own verified bill of particulars and examination before trial transcript testimony.

APPLICABLE LAW

Under the "no-fault" law, in order to maintain an action for personal injury, a plaintiff must establish that a "serious injury" has been sustained (Licari v. Elliot, 57 NY2d 230 [1982]). The proponent of a motion for summary judgment must tender sufficient evidence to show the absence of any material issue of fact and the right to judgment as a matter of law (Alvarez v. Prospect Hospital, 68 NY2d 320 [1986]; Winegrad v. New York Univ. Medical Center, 64 NY2d 851[1985]). In the present action, the burden rests on defendants to establish, by the submission of evidentiary proof in admissible form, that plaintiff has not suffered a "serious injury." (Lowe v. Bennett, 122 AD2d 728 [1st Dept 1986], affd, 69 NY2d 701, 512 NYS2d 364 [1986]). When a defendant's motion is sufficient to raise the issue of whether a "serious injury" has been sustained, the burden shifts and it is then incumbent upon the plaintiff to produce prima facie evidence in admissible form to support the claim of serious injury (Licari v. Elliot, supra; Lopez v. Senatore, 65 NY2d 1017 [1985]).

In support of a claim that plaintiff has not sustained a serious injury, a defendant may rely either on the sworn statements of the defendant's examining physician or the unsworn reports of plaintiff's examining physician (Pagano v. Kingsbury, 182 AD2d 268[2d Dept 1992]). Once the burden shifts, it is incumbent upon plaintiff, in opposition to defendant's motion, to submit proof of serious injury in "admissible form". Unsworn reports of plaintiff's examining doctor or chiropractor will not be sufficient to defeat a motion for summary judgment (Grasso v. Angerami, 79 NY2d 813 [1991]). Thus, a medical affirmation or affidavit which is based on a physician's personal examination and observations of plaintiff, is an acceptable method to provide a doctor's opinion regarding the existence and extent of a plaintiff's serious injury (O'Sullivan v. Atrium Bus Co., 246 AD2d 418 [1st Dept 1998]). Unsworn MRI reports are not competent evidence unless both sides rely on those reports (Gonzalez v. Vasquez, 301 AD2d 438 [1st Dept 2003]; Ayzen v. Melendez, 749 NYS2d 445 [2d Dept 2002]). However, in order to be sufficient to establish a prima facie case of serious physical injury the affirmation or affidavit must contain medical findings, which are based on the physician's own examination, tests and observations and review of the record rather than manifesting only the plaintiff's subjective complaints. It must be noted that a chiropractor is not one of the persons authorized by the CPLR to provide a statement by affirmation, and thus, for a chiropractor, only an affidavit containing the requisite findings will suffice (see, CPLR 2106; Pichardo v. Blum, 267 AD2d 441[2d Dept 1999];

Feintuch v. Grella, 209 AD2d 377[2d Dept 2003]).

In any event, the findings, which must be submitted in a competent statement under oath (or affirmation, when permitted) must demonstrate that plaintiff sustained at least one of the categories of "serious injury" as enumerated in Insurance Law § 5102(d) (Marquez v. New York City Transit Authority, 259 AD2d 261 [1st Dept 1999]; Tompkins v. Budnick, 236 AD2d 708[3rd Dept 1997]; Parker v. DeFontaine, 231 AD2d 412 [1st Dept 1996]; DiLeo v. Blumberg, 250 AD2d 364 [1st Dept 1998]). For example, in Parker, supra, it was held that a medical affidavit, which demonstrated that the plaintiff's threshold motion limitations were objectively measured and observed by the physician, was sufficient to establish that plaintiff has suffered a "serious injury" within the meaning of that term as set forth in Article 51 of the Insurance Law. In other words, "[a] physician's observation as to actual limitations qualifies as objective evidence since it is based on the physician's own examinations." Furthermore, in the absence of objective medical evidence in admissible form of serious injury, plaintiff's self-serving affidavit is insufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (Fisher v. Williams, 289 AD2d 288 [2d Dept 2001]).

DISCUSSION

A. *Moving defendants established a prima facie case that plaintiff did not suffer a "serious injury" as defined in Section 5102(d), for all categories.*

The affirmed report of moving defendants' independent examining neurologist, Jean-Robert Desrouleauux, M.D., indicates that an examination conducted on December 29, 2014 revealed a diagnosis of: resolved alleged injury to the cervical and lumbar spine and normal neurological examination. He opines that there is no permanence or residual effect anticipated in plaintiff's condition. Dr. Desrouleauux concludes that plaintiff can function in his pre-accident capacity and carry out his work duties and day-to-day activities without neurological restriction.

The affirmed report of moving defendants' independent examining orthopedist, Lisa Nason, M.D., indicates that an examination conducted on December 29, 2014 revealed a diagnosis of: resolved alleged injury to the cervical and lumbar spine and resolved alleged injury to bilateral knees. She opines that there is no evidence of residuals or permanency.

Finally, Dr. Nason concludes that plaintiff can perform his usual occupation and activities of daily living without restrictions.

The affirmed report of moving defendants' independent evaluating radiologist, Scott A. Springer, D.O. indicates that an MRI of the Cervical Spine dated March 15, 2013 indicates an impression of: no posttraumatic changes causally related to the subject accident. He opines that there are degenerative changes which are a chronic process and disc dessication.

The affirmed report of moving defendants' independent evaluating radiologist, Scott A. Springer, D.O. indicates that an MRI of the Lumbar Spine dated March 15, 2013 indicates an impression of: no posttraumatic changes causally related to the subject accident. He opines that there are degenerative changes which are a chronic process and disc dessication.

Additionally, moving defendants established a *prima facie* case for the category of "90/180 days." The plaintiff's verified bill of particulars indicates that: he was only confined to bed intermittently for a few days after the accident and home intermittently since the accident. The plaintiff's examination before trial transcript testimony indicates that he only missed about one (1) month and 15-20 days of work. Such evidence shows that the plaintiff was not curtailed from nearly all activities for the bare minimum of 90/180, required by the statute.

The aforementioned evidence amply satisfied moving defendants' initial burden of demonstrating that plaintiff did not sustain a "serious injury." Thus, the burden then shifted to plaintiff to raise a triable issue of fact that a serious injury was sustained within the meaning of the Insurance Law (see, Gaddy v. Eyler, 79 NY2d 955 [1992]). Failure to raise a triable issue of fact requires the granting of summary judgment and dismissal of the complaint (see, Licari v. Elliott, supra).

B. Plaintiff fails to raise a triable issue of fact

In opposition to the motion, plaintiff submitted: an attorney's affirmation, an affirmation of plaintiff's physician, Mike Pappas, D.O., and affirmations and sworn MRI reports of plaintiff's physician, Narayan Paruchuri, M.D.

In his affirmation, Dr. Pappas states that he reviewed medical records "prepared in connection with physical examinations and therapy visits made by the [plaintiff] while under [his] care" and affirms that he determined his diagnosis in part based on the physical therapy records, however, no therapy

records have been submitted to the court in competent and admissible form. The probative value of Dr. Pappas' affidavit is reduced by the doctor's reliance on medical records that are not in the record before the court. Since Dr. Pappas' conclusions improperly rested on another expert's work product, it is insufficient to raise a material triable factual issue (see, Constantinou v. Surinder, 8 AD3d 323 [2d Dept 2004]; Claude v. Clements, 301 AD2d 432 [2d Dept 2003]; Dominguez-Gionta v. Smith, 306 AD2d 432 [2d Dept 2003]; Codrington v. Ahmad, 40 AD3d 799 [2d Dept 2007]).

Also, the plaintiff has failed to come forward with sufficient evidence to create an issue of fact as to whether the plaintiff sustained a medically-determined injury which prevented him from performing substantially all of the material acts which constituted his usual and customary daily activities for not less than 90 of the 180 days immediately following the underlying accident (Savatarre v. Barnathan, 280 AD2d 537 [2d Dept 2001]). The record must contain objective or credible evidence to support the plaintiff's claim that the injury prevented plaintiff from performing substantially all of his customary activities (Watt v. Eastern Investigative Bureau, *Inc.*, 273 AD2d 226 [2d Dept 2000]). When construing the statutory definition of a 90/180-day claim, the words "substantially all" should be construed to mean that the person has been prevented from performing his usual activities to a great extent, rather than some slight curtailment (see, Gaddy v. Eyler, 79 NY2d 955; Licari v. Elliott, 57 NY2d 230 [1982]; Berk v. Lopez, 278 AD2d 156 [1st Dept 2000], lv denied 96 NY2d 708 [2001]). Plaintiff fails to include experts' reports or affirmations which render an opinion on the effect the injuries claimed may have had on the plaintiff for the 180-day period immediately following the accident. As such, plaintiff's submissions were insufficient to establish a triable issue of fact as to whether plaintiff suffered from a medically determined injury that curtailed him from performing his usual activities for the statutory period (Licari v. Elliott, 57 NY2d 230, 236 [1982]). Accordingly, plaintiff's claim that his injuries prevented him from performing substantially all of the material acts constituting his customary daily activities during at least 90 of the first 180 days following the accident is insufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (see, Graham v. Shuttle Bay, 281 AD2d 372 [1st Dept 2001]; Hernandez v. Cerda, 271 AD2d 569 [2d Dept 2000]; Ocasio v. Henry, 276 AD2d 611 [2d Dept 2000]).

Furthermore, plaintiff's attorney's affirmation is not admissible probative evidence on medical issues, as plaintiff's attorney has failed to demonstrate personal knowledge of the plaintiff's injuries (Sloan v. Schoen, 251 AD2d 319 [2d Dept

1998]).

Therefore, plaintiff's submissions are insufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (see, Zuckerman v. City of New York, 49 NY2d 557 [1980]).

Accordingly, the defendants' motion and cross-motion for summary judgment are granted in their entirety and the plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed as to all categories.

The clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

Movant shall serve a copy of this order with Notice of Entry upon the other parties of this action and on the clerk. If this order requires the clerk to perform a function, movant is directed to serve a copy upon the appropriate clerk.

The foregoing constitutes the decision and order of this Court.

Dated: September 8, 2015

.....
Howard G. Lane, J.S.C.