Buezo v Pi	att Inst.

2021 NY Slip Op 30971(U)

March 26, 2021

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 162512/2019

Judge: Erika M. Edwards

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op <u>30001(</u>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.

## FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/29/2021 10:15 AM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 43

PRESENT:	HON. ERIKA M. EDWARDS	PART 11	
	Justice		
	Χ	INDEX NO.	162512/2019
SINDY BUE		MOTION DATE	04/04/2021
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO.	002
	- V -		
PRATT INST and LPCIMIN	TITUTE, TISHMAN CONSTRUCTION CORP. NELLI,	P. DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION	
	Defendants.		
	X		
PRATT INST	TITUTE and TISHMAN CONSTRUCTION CORP.,	Third	
Third-Party Plaintiffs,		Index No. 59	96018/2020
	Third-Party Plaintiffs,		
	Third-Party Plaintiffs, -against-		
RV DRYWAI SAFETY GR	-against-		
SAFETY GR	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY OUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants.		
SAFETY GR	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY OUP, INC.,		
SAFETY GR	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY COUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. X e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu		3, 24, 25, 26, 27,
SAFETY GR  The following 28, 29, 30, 41	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY COUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. X e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu		
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY COUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. X e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu	umber (Motion 002) 2: UMMARY JUDGMEN	<u>т                                    </u>
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on Upon	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY COUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. X e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu , 42 this motion to/for	umber (Motion 002) 2: <u>UMMARY JUDGMEN</u> endant LPCiminelli's	T s ("LPC")
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on Upon motion for su	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY OUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. 	umber (Motion 002) 2: <u>UMMARY JUDGMEN</u> endant LPCiminelli's	T s ("LPC")
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on Upon motion for su Complaint an	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY OUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. 	umber (Motion 002) 2: UMMARY JUDGMEN endant LPCiminelli's euezo's ("Plaintiff")	T s ("LPC") Verified
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on Upon motion for su Complaint an Plaint	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY COUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. 	umber (Motion 002) 2: <u>UMMARY JUDGMEN</u> endant LPCiminelli's suezo's ("Plaintiff") ants/Third-Party Pla	T s ("LPC") Verified intiffs Pratt
SAFETY GR The following 28, 29, 30, 41 were read on Upon motion for su Complaint an Plaint Institute ("Pra	-against- LL CORP. and CONSTRUCTION REALTY OUP, INC., Third-Party Defendants. 	umber (Motion 002) 23 UMMARY JUDGMEN endant LPCiminelli's suezo's ("Plaintiff") ants/Third-Party Pla ants) for personal inju	T s ("LPC") Verified intiffs Pratt uries she

162512/2019 BUEZO, SINDY vs. PRATT INSTITUTE Motion No. 002

Page 1 of 4

LPC now moves for summary judgment in its favor and for an order dismissing Plaintiff's Verified Complaint, all cross-claims asserted by Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs, and denying Plaintiff's motion to compel, which was really a motion to strike Defendants' Answers for failure to comply with discovery demands that was subsequently withdrawn. To date, none of the other parties have opposed this motion.

LPC argues in substance that dismissal is warranted because Pratt terminated its construction manager services of the site with a written Termination Notice, dated March 22, 2018, as of April 22, 2018, which was more than one year prior to Plaintiff's alleged accident. LPC further argues that Pratt took over the site and LPC was not present and had no responsibility or involvement with the site on the date of Plaintiff's alleged accident.

To prevail on a motion for summary judgment, the movant must make a prima facie showing of entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, tendering sufficient admissible evidence to demonstrate the absence of any material issues of fact (*Zuckerman v City of New York*, 49 NY2d 557, 562 [1980]; *Jacobsen v New York City Health and Hospitals Corp.*, 22 NY3d 824, 833 [2014]; *Alvarez v Prospect Hosp.*, 68 NY2d 320, 324 [1986]). The submission of evidentiary proof must be in admissible form (*Friends of Animals v Associated Fur Mfrs.*, 46 NY2d 1065, 1067-68 [1979]). The movant's initial burden is a heavy one and on a motion for summary judgment, facts must be viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party (*Jacobsen*, 22 NY3d at 833; *William J. Jenack Estate Appraisers and Auctioneers, Inc. v Rabizadeh*, 22 NY3d 470, 475 [2013]).

If the moving party fails to make such prima facie showing, then the court is required to deny the motion, regardless of the sufficiency of the non-movant's papers (*Winegrad v New York Univ. Med. Center*, 4 NY2d 851, 853 [1985]). However, if the moving party meets its burden,

## FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/29/2021 10:15 AM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 43

then the burden shifts to the party opposing the motion to establish by admissible evidence the existence of a factual issue requiring a trial of the action or tender an acceptable excuse for his failure to do so (*Zuckerman*, 49 NY2d at 560; *Jacobsen*, 22 NY3d at 833; *Vega v Restani Construction Corp.*, 18 NY3d 499, 503 [2012]).

Upon review of the admissible evidence and without opposition, the court finds that LPC has met its burden of establishing that it is entitled to summary judgment in its favor as a matter of law as its services were terminated and it had no connection to the construction site for approximately fifteen (15) months prior to Plaintiff's alleged accident.

Therefore, the court grants LPC's motion for summary judgment in its favor and dismisses Plaintiff's Verified Complaint and all cross-claims against LPC.

As such, it is hereby

ORDERED that Defendant LPCiminelli's motion for summary judgment dismissal of Plaintiff Sindy Buezo's Verified Complaint and all cross-claims asserted against it is granted and the Verified Complaint is dismissed as against Defendant LPCiminelli only; and it is further

ORDERED that all cross-claims against Defendant LPCiminelli asserted by Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs Pratt Institute and Tishman Construction Corp. are dismissed as against Defendant LPCiminelli only; and it is further

ORDERED that said claims and cross-claims against Defendant LPCiminelli are severed and the balance of the action shall continue; and it is

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in favor of Defendant LPCiminelli dismissing the claims and cross-claims made against it with prejudice and without costs to any party; and it is further

## FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/29/2021 10:15 AM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 43

## ORDERED that this is the Decision and Order of the court.

3/26/2021	_	ERIKA M. EDWARDS, J.S.C.
DATE		HON. ERIKA M. EDWARDS, J.S.G.
CHECK ONE:	CASE DISPOSED	X NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
APPLICATION: CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	SETTLE ORDER	

1