Feeney	y v Howa	rd Hugh	nes Corp.
--------	----------	---------	-----------

2020 NY Slip Op 33256(U)

October 5, 2020

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 150617/2020

Judge: Kathryn E. Freed

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(U), are republished from various New York State and local government sources, including the New York State Unified Court System's eCourts Service.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

INDEX NO. 150617/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 10/05/2020

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT:	HON. KATHRYN E. FREED	_ PART	IAS MOTION 2EFM
	Justice		
	X	INDEX NO.	150617/2020
DARLENE F	EENEY,		
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO	001
	- V -		
CITY ECON SOUTH STE SEAPORT N LLC, NEW Y	RD HUGHES CORPORATION, NEW YORK OMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, REET SEAPORT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, 'ORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF SMALL SERVICES, and THE CITY OF NEW YORK,	DECISION + MOT	
	Defendants.		
	X		
_	e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document rs, 19, 20, 21, 22	number (Motion 001)	10, 11, 12, 13, 14,
were read on	this motion to/for	DISMISS	

In this personal injury action commenced by plaintiff Darlene Feeney, defendant The Howard Hughes Corporation moves, pursuant to CPLR 3211(a)(1) and 3211(c), to dismiss the complaint. Plaintiff opposes the motion. After a review of the motion papers, as well the relevant statutes and case law, the motion is decided as follows.

This case arises from an incident on July 9, 2019 in which plaintiff was allegedly injured when she tripped and fell on a boardwalk at 89 South Street at the South Street Seaport, Pier 17, New York, New York ("the premises") as a result of the negligence of defendants The Howard Hughes Corporation ("HHC"), The New York City Economic Development Corporation, South Street Seaport Limited Partnership, Seaport Management Development Company, LLC, New York City Department of Small Business Services, and The City of New York ("the City") in

150617/2020 FEENEY, DARLENE vs. HOWARD HUGHES CORPORATION Motion No. 001

Page 1 of 4

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 27

[* 2]

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 10/05/2020

operating, managing, and maintaining the premises. Doc. 1. Plaintiff commenced the captioned action by filing a summons and complaint against defendants in January 2020. Doc. 1.

In lieu of answering, HHC now moves, pursuant to CPLR 3211(a)(1) and 3211(c), to dismiss the complaint. HHC argues that the claims against it must be dismissed since it had no ownership interest, possession, or control of the premises. Doc. 11. In support of its position, HHC submits the Affidavit of Aaron Grodin, its Assistant General Counsel, who states, inter alia, that HHC did not own the premises; was not the lessee of any part of the premises; "did not maintain any presence on or around the premises in question on the date of the alleged accident"; and had no other involvement at the premises. Doc. 15. Therefore, argues HHC, it neither owed nor breached any duty to plaintiff.

In opposition to the motion, plaintiff's counsel argues that: 1) according to Wikipedia, Pier 17 is currently owned and managed by HHC; 2) after plaintiff served a Notice of Claim on the City alleging that it was responsible for plaintiff's accident, the City wrote to him to advise that HHC may have been responsible for the incident; and 3) a sign at the premises lists HHC as a contact, specifically stating that the premises are "Maintained by Seaport@Howard Hughes (212) 732-8257", which number is that of HHC. Given these indications of HHC's involvement at the premises, plaintiff insists that the motion cannot be granted, especially since no discovery has been conducted.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS:

CPLR 3211(a)(1) allows a defendant to "move for judgment dismissing one or more causes of action asserted against him on the ground that . . . a defense is founded upon documentary evidence." Although Grodin maintains in his affidavit that HHC had no

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 27

[* 3]

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 10/05/2020

ownership, leasehold, or other interest or involvement in the premises, such an affidavit is not "documentary evidence" for the purposes of CPLR 3211(a)(1). See Celentano v Boo Realty, LLC, 160 AD3d 576, 577 (1st Dept 2018) citing Flowers v 73rd Townhouse LLC, 99 AD3d 431 (1st Dept 2012); Tsimerman v Janoff, 40 AD3d 242 (1st Dept 2007); see also Bou v Llamoza, 173 AD3d 575 (1st Dept 2019) citing Art & Fashion Group Corp. v Cyclops Prod., Inc., 120 AD3d 436 (1st Dept 2014).

Further, Grodin's affidavit is conclusory, insofar as he sets forth absolutely no basis for the information he sets forth therein. Even if this Court were to consider the affidavit, it is insufficient to warrant dismissal of the complaint since it does not address any of the indications, set forth in the affirmation of plaintiff's counsel, suggesting that HHC owned, managed, and/or controlled the premises. See Celentano v Boo Realtv, LLC, 160 AD3d 576 at 577. Nor does Grodin submit an affidavit in reply explaining why the indications of HHC's involvement at the premises raised by plaintiff's counsel do not warrant the denial of the motion.

Additionally, HHC is not entitled to dismissal pursuant to CPLR 3211(c). Pursuant to that section, a motion to dismiss may be treated as one for summary judgment by the court "...after adequate notice to the parties has been given." Here, no such notice has been given, and there is no indication that the parties have charted a "summary judgment course." Brathwaite v. Frankel, 98 A.D.3d 444 (1st Dept. 2012). Even assuming, arguendo, that HHC's motion were treated as one for summary judgment, it would be denied given the factual issues raised by plaintiff's counsel regarding HHC's possible involvement at the premises.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing, it is hereby:

[*4] NYSCEF DOC. NO. 27

INDEX NO. 150617/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 10/05/2020

ORDERED that the motion by defendant The Howard Hughes Corporation is denied in all respects; and it is further

ORDERED that the parties are to participate in a telephonic preliminary conference on January 13, 2020 at 10 a.m.; and it is further

ORDERED that this constitutes the decision and order of the court.

10/5/2020		202 <u>01005143706KERBE-05</u> 4D754EFEF184P0D869140SE76E12863
DATE	-	KATHRYN E. FREED, J.S.C.
CHECK ONE:	CASE DISPOSED	X NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
	GRANTED X DENIED	GRANTED IN PART OTHER
APPLICATION:	SETTLE ORDER	SUBMIT ORDER
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN	FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT REFERENCE

150617/2020 FEENEY, DARLENE vs. HOWARD HUGHES CORPORATION Motion No. 001

Page 4 of 4