Five Star Elec. Corp. v 86th St. Constructors Joint Venture

2021 NY Slip Op 30894(U)

March 18, 2021

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 651499/2018

Judge: Debra A. James

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. 651499/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/18/2021

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

PRESENT:	HON. DEBRA A. JAMES	PART I	AS MOTION 59EFM	
	Justice	e		
	X	INDEX NO.	651499/2018	
FIVE STAR ELECTRIC CORP,		MOTION DATE	06/14/2019	
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO	o002	
	- V -			
86TH STREET CONSTRUCTORS JOINT VENTURE, Defendant.			DECISION + ORDER ON	
		MOTION		
	X			
	e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document 5, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58		37, 38, 39, 40, 41,	
were read on this motion to/for		DISMISS .		
	ODDED			

ORDER

Upon the foregoing documents, it is

ORDERED that the motion to dismiss of defendant is granted to the extent that the fourth (breach of fundamental obligations of contract), fifth (breach by "change and abandonment" of contract), sixth (breach of "obligation to negotiate in good faith"), eighth (breach of material terms of contract), ninth (breach of fiduciary duty) and tenth (unjust enrichment) causes of action of the amended complaint are dismissed, and the motion is otherwise denied; and it is further

ORDERED that defendant is directed to serve an answer to the amended complaint within 20 days after service of a copy of this order with notice of entry; and it is further

651499/2018 FIVE STAR ELECTRIC CORP. vs. 86TH STREET CONSTRUCTORS Motion No. 002

Page 1 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/18/2021 02:56 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 651499/2018
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/18/2021

ORDERED that counsel are directed to post to NYSCEF a proposed preliminary conference order or a counter proposed preliminary conference order on April 19, 2021.

DECISION

It is hornbook law that "[w]hen a court rules on a CPLR 3211 motion to dismiss, it 'must accept as true the facts as alleged in the complaint and submissions in opposition to the motion, accord plaintiff[] the benefit of every possible favorable inference and determine only whether the facts as alleged fit within any cognizable legal theory'"(Whitebox Concentrated Convertible Arbitrage Ptnrs LP v Superior Well Servs, Inc, 20 NY3d 59, 63 [2012] [citations omitted]).

Here, the facts of neither the ninth cause of action for breach of fiduciary duty nor of the tenth cause of action for unjust enrichment, as alleged in the amended complaint, state cognizable claims. As to breach of fiduciary duty, plaintiff makes no factual allegations as to any special relationship between the parties to the subcontract (see GSCP VI EdgeMarc Holdings, LLC v ETC Northeast Pipeline, LLC, _AD3d _, 2021 NY Slip Op 01356 [1st Dept 2021]). With respect to unjust enrichment, plaintiff does not dispute the existence of a subcontract that governs the parties' dispute, which subcontract defendant acknowledges, and therefore such claim may not be

651499/2018 FIVE STAR ELECTRIC CORP. vs. 86TH STREET CONSTRUCTORS Motion No. 002

Page 2 of 4

NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/18/2021 02:56

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 651499/2018 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/18/2021

maintained (see Goldstein v CIBC World Markets Corp, 6 AD3d 295, 296 [1st Dept 2004]).

This courts finds that the fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth causes of action are repetitive of the first, second, third, and seventh causes of action of the amended complaint that also sound in breach of contract, and therefore shall dismiss same (see Squire Records, Inc v Vanguard Recording Soc, Inc, 25 AD2d 190, 192 [1st Dept 1966]).

With respect to defendant's argument that plaintiff has not sufficiently pled that it provided timely written notice of claims, concededly a condition precedent under the subcontract, this court disagrees. The allegations of paragraphs 20 and 21 of the complaint suffice in that regard (see 1199 Housing International Fidelity Ins Co, 14 AD3d 383, 384 [1st Dept 2005]). As the First Department held in 1199 Housing Corp, with respect to the defense of failure to comply with a condition precedent of a contract, the pleading burden rests upon defendant. Moreover, this court never elected to notify the parties that it would treat defendant's motion for dismissal as one for summary judgment. Thus, it would be inappropriate for the court to order an immediate trial on the issue of timely notice, prior to joinder of issue pursuant to CPLR 3211(c).

Subcontract ¶4.1 provides, as a condition precedent to its rights to claim extra compensation and reimbursement for extra

651499/2018 FIVE STAR ELECTRIC CORP. vs. 86TH STREET CONSTRUCTORS Motion No. 002

Page 3 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/18/2021 02:56 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 70

INDEX NO. 651499/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 03/18/2021

work, that plaintiff submit to defendant verified, time and material records on a daily basis of all work performed under protest. On that basis, the first and second causes of action for breach of contract are cognizable.

As to the third cause of action for breach of contract arising from extra work and unknown delays, this court finds that such claim sufficiently asserts damages for delays that were not contemplated in either the subcontract or the Acceleration Agreement of April 11, 2016. Thus, this court finds that such cause of action seeks damages that are exceptions to the enforceability of the "no-damages-for delay" provisions of the subcontract, as set forth in Corinno Civetta Constr Corp v City of New York, (67 NY2d 297, 309-311 [1986]).

Subcontract ¶ 2.1 provides: "Any payment for work performed or materials supplied that has been properly invoiced and is more than seven (7) calendar days due shall bear interest at the rate set from time to time by the State Tax Commission." Such provision supports plaintiff's seventh cause of action seeking an award of interest for late payments.

Pegra A- Janes 20210318145627DJAMES96DD89CD506B4438A74BA075993F7B46 3/18/2021 DEBRA A. JAMES, J.S.C. DATE **CHECK ONE: CASE DISPOSED NON-FINAL DISPOSITION GRANTED** DENIED **GRANTED IN PART** OTHER APPLICATION: SETTLE ORDER SUBMIT ORDER REFERENCE **CHECK IF APPROPRIATE: INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN** FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT 651499/2018 FIVE STAR ELECTRIC CORP. vs. 86TH STREET CONSTRUCTORS Page 4 of 4 Motion No. 002