|--|

2020 NY Slip Op 34046(U)

December 8, 2020

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 652972/2015

Judge: David Benjamin Cohen

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.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 652972/2015

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/08/2020

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

PRESENT:	HON. DAVID BENJAMIN COHEN	PART	IAS MOTION 58EFM			
	Justice					
	X	INDEX NO.	652972/2015			
STACEY HOROWITZ,		MOTION DATE	N/A, N/A			
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. N	o002 003			
	- V -					
MORGAN C MORGAN, C MORGAN; A AS THE PLA SECURITIES SERVICES, SERVICES, HOLDINGS	N CHASE, JP MORGAN CHASE & CO., JP HASE NA, JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, JP CHASE BANK, CHASE, CHASE BANK, ; JP ASSET MANAGEMENT; COUNTY ACE OF TRIAL JP MORGAN S;LLC;, JP MORGAN INSTITUTIONAL FUNDS AMERICAN CENTURY INVESTMENT INC, AMERICAN CENTURY PROPRIETARY INC, AMERICAN CENTURY INVESTMENTS, OROWITZ, JANE DOE	DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION				
	Defendant. X					
The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 002) 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 52, 53 were read on this motion to/for						
	e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu 9, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68	mber (Motion 003)	1 40, 47, 48, 49, 50,			
were read on	this motion to/for	DISMISS .				
Upon the for	egoing documents					
Plain	tiff, as the assignee of third-party plaintiff Amer	ican Century Inv	estments ("ACI"),			
moved (Moti	on Sequence 2) for a default judgment against d	efendant JP Mor	gan Chase Bank,			
N.A. ("Chase	e") based upon Chase's failure to answer the thir	d-party complair	nt. Chase opposed			
the motion ar	nd moved to dismiss the Complaint filed by plain	ntiff.				
Plain	tiff commenced this action by summons with no	tice on August 27	7, 2015. Over a			
year later, on	November 14, 2016, plaintiff filed the Complain	nt and served it o	on ACI and an			
entity, JP Mo	organ Chase &co. On May 26, 2017, ACI filed i	ts Answer with a	cross-claim			

652972/2015 HOROWITZ, STACEY vs. JP MORGAN CHASE Motion No. 002 003

Page 1 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 12/08/2020 01:05 PM

INDEX NO. 652972/2015

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/08/2020

against JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. The crossclaim alleged Chase, not ACI, was liable to plaintiff to the extent plaintiff's claim was granted against ACI, or any judgment/order was entered awarding damages to plaintiff and against ACI, or if ACI was otherwise found liable to plaintiff, ACI was entitled to full indemnification and contribution from Chase. The cross-claim was served on June 6, 2017.

On November 9, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion seeking a default judgment against Chase. On February 27, 2018, this Court denied the motion as the affidavit of service on plaintiff's claim was not for Chase but rather JP Morgan Chase &co. Indeed, plaintiff never served Chase and only served JP Morgan Chase &co. On December 4, 2019, plaintiff filed Motion Sequence 2. Plaintiff argues that on April 23, 2019, ACI and plaintiff entered into an agreement that assigned all of ACI's right, title and interest in the crossclaim. As Chase was served by ACI and failed to answer, plaintiff, as the assignee of ACI, was seeking a default judgment based upon this failure to answer. Chase opposed the motion and filed its own motion (Motion Sequence 3) to dismiss all claims against it except for the claims against JP Morgan Chase &co.

As a threshold, with respect to claims against entities with some iteration of Chase in its name, all claims against any entity other than JP Morgan Chase &co and Chase are dismissed as neither plaintiff, nor ACI contends that such entities were served. Specifically, as previously ruled, Chase was not served by plaintiff and any direct claim by plaintiff against Chase is dismissed.

Further, as described above Chase was served by ACI on June 6, 2017. ACI did not move for a default judgment during the one year period required under CPLR 3215(c). This motion was not filed until December 2019, more than two and a half years after Chase was served by ACI. Even assuming plaintiff steps into the shoes of ACI, ACI was required to seek a

652972/2015 HOROWITZ, STACEY vs. JP MORGAN CHASE Motion No. 002 003

Page 2 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 12/08/2020 01:05 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 652972/2015

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/08/2020

default judgment long before plaintiff and ACI entered into their agreement and thus, steps into those "shoes." No explanation for the delay was provided, nor was an explanation provided why there was a nearly eight-month delay in plaintiff seeking a default judgment against Chase once it was assigned the rights. Plaintiff's evidence in continuing engagement in this lawsuit was a motion filed in November 2017, two years prior to this motion and decided shortly thereafter in February 2018. It took the Court's initiative by placing this matter on the dismissal/blockbuster calendar to have any movement in this action. Thus, for failure to move for a default judgment in a timely manner, the motion is denied. The Court also notes that ACI served a Jane Doe and Nathan Horowitz, but no one has moved against those defendants. Similarly, plaintiff never moved for a default judgment against JP Morgan Chase &co. Pursuant to CPLR 3215(c), the claims against them are also dismissed.

Further, the settlement agreement between ACI and plaintiff includes a statement of no liability or admission of guilt/fault by ACI and that the sole consideration was the assignment of ACI's claims against Chase. In addition, plaintiff's action against Chase has now been dismissed. ACI, and thus plaintiff's claim, is entirely premised that to the extent plaintiff's claim was granted against ACI, or any judgment/order was entered awarding damages to plaintiff and against ACI, or if ACI was otherwise found liable to plaintiff, ACI was entitled to full indemnification and contribution from Chase. Here, the Court has ruled that there is no claim against Chase and the matter between plaintiff and ACI has been resolved. Thus, as there is no liability against ACI and no monetary consideration, the claim for indemnification fails as neither Chase, nor ACI has monetary liability to plaintiff. Accordingly, it is therefore

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for a default judgment against JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. is denied: and it is further

652972/2015 HOROWITZ, STACEY vs. JP MORGAN CHASE Motion No. 002 003

Page 3 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 12/08/2020 01:05 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 652972/2015

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/08/2020

ORDERED that pursuant to CPLR 3215(c) and 3211(a)(8) as certain defendants, and third-party defendants, have never been served and as a default judgment was not timely sought against those who were served and failed to answer, this action is dismissed.

					20201209130519 <del>0 COHEN9E</del> 3EC4 <b>1</b> 32B5	C47 DA09D15A2DD08DA34
12/8/2020						
DATE	-				DAVID BENJAMIN C	OHEN, J.S.C.
CHECK ONE:	Х	CASE DISPOSED			NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	
		GRANTED	DENIED	Х	GRANTED IN PART	OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER			SUBMIT ORDER	
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		INCLUDES TRANSF	ER/REASSIGN		FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT	REFERENCE