V	V۵	lle	: V	Gu	ızn	nan	

2021 NY Slip Op 30040(U)

January 8, 2021

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 154962/2019

Judge: Laurence L. Love

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. 154962/2019

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/08/2021

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

PRESENT:	HON. LAURENCE L. LOVE	PART	IAS MOTION 62			
	Just	tice				
		-X INDEX NO.	154962/2019			
DEREK WEL	LS,	MOTION DATE	11/19/2020			
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO.	002			
	- V -					
LUIS GUZMA CITY OF NEV	AN, NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY, W YORK	DECISION + C	DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION			
	Defendant.					
		-X				
	e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF docume, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56	ent number (Motion 002) 4	0, 41, 42, 43, 44,			
were read on t	ere read on this motion to/for REARGUMENT/RECONSIDERATION .					
Upon the fore	egoing documents, the motion is decided as	follows:				

In an Order dated April 21, 2020, this Court, denied, with leave to renew upon proper papers, defendants' cross-motion seeking summary judgment, dismissing this action based upon defendants' failure to establish their entitlement to dismissal pursuant to the Graves Amendment (see 49 USC § 30106 [a]; *Ballatore v HUB Truck Rental Corp.*, 83 AD3d 978, 979 [2011]). Defendant, the City of New York now moves to reargue said Order.

A motion to reargue is addressed to the sound discretion of the court and is designed to afford a party an opportunity to demonstrate that the court overlooked or misapprehended the relevant facts or misapplied controlling principles of law (see, *Schneider v. Solowey*, 141 AD2d 813 [2d Dept 1988]; *Rodney v. New York Pyrotechnic Products, Inc.*, 112 AD2d 410 [2d Dept 1985]). A "motion to reargue is not an opportunity to present new facts or arguments not previously offered, nor it is designed for litigants to present the same arguments already considered

[\* 2]

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 79 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/08/2021

by the court" (see, Pryor v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co., 17 AD3d 434 [2d Dept 2005];

Simon v. Mehryari, 16 AD3d 664 [2d Dept 2005]).

The instant action arises out of a motor vehicle accident which occurred on November 19,

2018. Plaintiff alleges that while fully stopped, in his lane, for approximately ten seconds, he was

struck in the rear by a vehicle operated by defendant, Luis A. Guzman and owned by the municipal

defendants.

In support of its original motion, defendants submitted the affidavits of Utilda Ramsay, a

claims specialist employed by MTA/New York City Transit Authority and Joseph Cappellino, a

computer administrator employed by the NYC DOT Fleet Services, which established the

following: The New York City Transit Authority is in the business of providing public

transportation and regularly leases busses and vehicles to private carriers. The Transit Authority is

the owner of a 2015 Toyota Sedan, New York License Number BA 9841, VIN Number

4T1BF1FK7FUl14628. Said Toyota was leased to MV Public Transportation, Inc. Mr. Guzman's

affidavit established that at the time of the accident, he was employed by Metropolitan

Transportation and driving an MV Transportation vehicle.

Defendants' underlying motion was denied on the basis that the municipal defendants

failed to establish entitlement to summary judgment based upon their failure to attach and

authenticate the lease in their motion papers. However, said denial is only relevant as to the causes

of action asserted against the New York City Transit Authority. As the evidence conclusively

establishes that the vehicle involved in the accident was owned by the Transit Authority and

operated by Luis Guzman in the course of his employment with MV Public Transportation, Inc,

the City of New York should have been granted summary judgment, dismissing this action as there

is no theory of liability relevant to the City. As such, it is hereby

154962/2019 WELLS, DEREK A. vs. GUZMAN, LUIS A. Motion No. 002

Page 2 of 4

2 of 4

INDEX NO. 154962/2019

[\* 3]

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 79 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/08/2021

ORDERED that defendants' motion seeking leave to reargue is GRANTED and upon

reargument, it is

ORDERED that the branch of defendants' cross-motion seeking dismissal of this action as

to the New York City Transit Authority is denied with leave to renew upon proper papers.

ORDERED that branch of defendants' cross-motion seeking summary judgment,

dismissing the City of New York from this action is GRANTED, and the complaint is dismissed

in its entirety as against said defendant, with costs and disbursements to said defendant as taxed

by the Clerk of the Court, and the Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly in favor of said

defendant; and it is further

ORDERED that the action is severed and continued against the remaining defendants; and

it is further

ORDERED that the caption be amended to reflect the dismissal and that all future papers

filed with the court bear the amended caption; and it is further

ORDERED that counsel for the moving party shall serve a copy of this order with notice

of entry upon the Clerk of the Court (60 Centre Street, Room 141B) and the Clerk of the General

Clerk's Office (60 Centre Street, Room 119), who are directed to mark the court's records to reflect

the change in the caption herein; and it is further

ORDERED that such service upon the Clerk of the Court and the Clerk of the General

Clerk's Office shall be made in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Protocol on

Courthouse and County Clerk Procedures for Electronically Filed Cases (accessible at the "E-

Filing" page on the court's website at the address www.nycourts.gov/supctmanh)].

The instant action and all pending motions are respectfully referred to the Transit part as

the City of New York is no longer a party to this action.

154962/2019 WELLS, DEREK A. vs. GUZMAN, LUIS A. Motion No. 002

Page 3 of 4

3 of 4

[\* 4] INDEX NO. 154962/2019

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 79 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/08/2021

1/8/2021	_				
DATE				LAURENCE L. LOV	E, J.S.C.
CHECK ONE:		CASE DISPOSED	Х	NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	
	Х	GRANTED DENIED		GRANTED IN PART	OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER		SUBMIT ORDER	
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	Х	INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN		FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT	REFERENCE