	-								_					
١	л	w	и	•	۰	\mathbf{a}						ts		n
١	м	и.	ı	ш	Ł	œ	١,	•		1 - 1	U	LO	u	

2021 NY Slip Op 31785(U)

May 26, 2021

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 160022/2020

Judge: Carol R. Edmead

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. 26

INDEX NO. 160022/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

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

PRESENT:	HON. CAROL R. EDMEAD	PART I	AS MOTION 35EFM		
	Justice				
	X	INDEX NO.	160022/2020		
SHAUN WHI	ITE,	MOTION DATE	11/19/2020		
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO	o. 001		
	- V -				
JEREMY DE FINANCE	EUTSCH, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF	DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION			
	Defendant.				
	X				
	e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nur, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25	mber (Motion 001)	2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13,		
were read on t	this motion to/forARTICL	E 78 (BODY OR OFFICER)			
Upon the fore	egoing documents, it is				
ADJU	JDGED that the petition for relief, pursuant to C	PLR Article 78, o	of petitioner Shaun		
Gregory Whi	te (motion sequence number 001) is denied, and	this proceeding i	s dismissed; and it		
is further					
ORDI	ERED that counsel for respondent New York Ci	ty Department of	Finance shall		

serve a copy of this order along with notice of entry on all parties within ten (10) days.

INDEX NO. 160022/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

In this special proceeding, petitioner Shaun Gregory White (White) seeks a judgment to overturn an order of the respondent New York City Department of Finance (DOF) as arbitrary and capricious, as well as ancillary declaratory relief (motion sequence number 001). For the following reasons, this petition is denied and this proceeding is dismissed.

FACTS

On December 24, 2019, a New York Police Department (NYPD) traffic agent issued parking violation summons number 876121771-2 to White as the owner of a black, 2014 Mercedes Benz sedan bearing New York State license plate "PLAINTIF," which was parked in front on the north side of Abby Place twenty-five feet West of Walbrooke Avenue in the County of Richmond, City and State of New York (the summons). *See* verified petition, ¶ 6; exhibit A. The summons stated as follows:

"THE OPERATOR AND OWNER OF THE VEHICLE ARE CHARGED AS FOLLOWS:

"In Violation of NYC Traffic Rules, and Section: 4-08 (j) (3) - Improp[e]r D[i]spl[a]y of Reg[istration] St[i]ck[e]r."

Id., exhibit A. The traffic agent noted on the summons that the subject registration "sticker [was] on [the] dash," and specified a fine amount of \$65.00. See verified answer, ¶ 39; exhibit 1. On December 24, 2020, White submitted a request to the DOF's Parking Violations Bureau (PVB) via email for a hearing on the grounds that the summons was facially insufficient. See verified petition, ¶ 9; exhibit B. On December 31, 2019, co-respondent PVB administrative law judge Jeremy Deustch (ALJ Deustch) issued a decision that upheld the summons (the ALJ's decision), and found, in pertinent part, as follows:

"It is a violation to display the sticker on the dash. Implicit in the requirement that the vehicle display a current registration sticker is the requirement that the sticker be properly displayed in the vehicle. The sticker must be properly affixed to the windshield in a timely manner."

INDEX NO. 160022/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

See verified answer, ¶ 41; exhibit 4. On January 2, 2020, White filed an administrative appeal of the ALJ's decision. *Id.*, ¶ 42; exhibit 5. On January 22, 2020, the PVB Appeals Board issued a decision that affirmed the ALJ's decision, and stated that "we find no reversible error in the decision below" (the Appeals Board order). *Id.*, ¶ 43; exhibit 6. White states that he paid the \$65.00 fine on September 9, 2020. *See* verified petition, ¶ 15; exhibit E.

Nevertheless, still aggrieved, White commenced this Article 78 proceeding on November 23, 2020. *See* verified petition. After a number of delays occasioned by the Covid-19 national pandemic, the DOF eventually filed an answer on February 1, 2021. *See* verified answer. This matter is now fully submitted (motion sequence number 001).

DISCUSSION

A trial court's role in an Article 78 proceeding is to determine whether, upon the facts before an administrative agency, a challenged agency determination had a rational basis in the record or was arbitrary and capricious. See Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County, 34 NY2d 222 (1974); Matter of E.G.A. Assoc. Inc. v New York State Div. of Hous. & Community Renewal, 232 AD2d 302 (1st Dept 1996). A determination is only deemed arbitrary and capricious if it is "without sound basis in reason, and in disregard of the facts." See Matter of Century Operating Corp. v Popolizio, 60 NY2d 483, 488 (1983), citing Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County, 34 NY2d at 231. However, if there is a rational basis for the administrative determination, there can be no judicial interference. Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County, 34 NY2d at 231-232.

INDEX NO. 160022/2020

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

Here, White argues that the Appeals Board order was arbitrary and capricious because it erroneously upheld the finding in the ALJ's order regarding the display of registration stickers in vehicle windshields. *See* verified petition, ¶¶ 18-23. White particularly complains that:

"Deutsch and the DOF's broadened interpretation of NYC Traffic Rules, Section 4- 08 (j) (3) includes an unstated, absolute requirement that a registration sticker be 'properly' displayed, and thus must be affixed to the windshield without exception, which does not take into consideration the superseding rules, regulations and policies of the Department of Motor Vehicles, which allows for concurrent display of proof during a reasonable time period after renewal."

Id., ¶ 21. The DOF responds that the ALJ's and Appeals Board's findings were reasonable because they were not based on an "interpretation" of 34 RCNY \S 4-08 (j) (3), but on the actual text of the regulation, which provides that:

"No person shall stand or park a vehicle bearing a New York plate or plates *unless it properly displays a current registration sticker*." (emphasis added)

See respondents' mem of law at 9-11. The DOF also asserts that the law affords it a "highly deferential" standard of review in the interpretation of the regulations that it enforces. *Id.*, at 8-9.

The court agrees. It is well settled that "[t]he interpretations of [a] respondent agency of statutes which it administers are entitled to deference if not unreasonable or irrational." *Matter of Metropolitan Assoc. Ltd. Partnership v New York State Div. of Hous. & Community Renewal*, 206 AD2d 251, 252 (1st Dept 1994), citing *Matter of Salvati v Eimicke*, 72 NY2d 784, 791 (1988).

Here, since the DOF's PVB is charged with enforcing the regulation that requires the "proper display" of a current vehicle registration sticker, it is evident that the issue of what constitutes "proper display" is a matter committed to the PVB's judgment. Here, too, the Appeals Board found that it was rational for ALJ Deutsch to determine that White had violated 34 RCNY § 4-08 (j) (3) by placing his vehicle's current registration sticker on its dash rather than affixing it to its window. As a result, in the absence of a showing that this was not a

COUNTY CLERK 05/26/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

INDEX NO. 160022/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

rational interpretation of the regulation, the court cannot interfere with the Appeals Board's determination. Matter of Pell v Board of Educ. of Union Free School Dist. No. 1 of Towns of Scarsdale & Mamaroneck, Westchester County, 34 NY2d at 231-232. White argues that the ALJ's and Appeals Board's interpretation of 34 RCNY § 4-08 (j) (3) was not rational because it conflicts with the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) regulation set forth in 15 NYCRR 17.4 (d) which governs the placement of windshield stickers. See White reply affirmation, ¶¶ 6-16. The court finds this argument unpersuasive for two reasons. First, VTL § 236 (1) invests the DOF's PVB with only the limited authority to adjudicate "parking violations," which are defined as "the violation of any law, rule or regulation providing for or regulating the parking, stopping or standing of a vehicle." The statute does not appear to authorize the PVB to enforce or adjudicate purported violations of DMV regulations, such as 15 NYCRR 17.4 (d). Thus, White's invocation of 15 NYCRR 17.4 (d) is of no moment. Second, the text of 15 NYCRR 17.4 (d) itself provides that "[w]indshield stickers shall be placed on the left-hand side of the inside front windshield," and that "old or expired windshield stickers shall be removed before *placement* of a current validating sticker on the windshield" (emphasis added). This undercut's White's assertion that it is "proper" to instead simply lay a registration sticker on a vehicle's dash. As a result, the court rejects White's arguments herein, and concludes that the Appeals Board's decision was rationally based, and not an arbitrary and capricious ruling.

Accordingly, the court finds that this Article 78 petition should be denied as meritless, and that this proceeding should be dismissed.

DECISION

ACCORDINGLY, for the foregoing reasons it is hereby

160022/2020 WHITE, SHAUN GREGORY vs. DEUTSCH, JEREMY Motion No. 001

Page 5 of 6

COUNTY CLERK 05/26/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 05/26/2021

INDEX NO. 160022/2020

ADJUDGED that the petition for relief, pursuant to CPLR Article 78, of petitioner Shaun Gregory White (motion sequence number 001) is denied, and this proceeding is dismissed; and it is further

ORDERED that counsel for respondent New York City Department of Finance shall serve a copy of this order along with notice of entry on all parties within ten (10) days.

				J	A 2	02(0526092942CED)MEAD7F88630B096	, 16412	182F& 6C2035649BA
5/26/2021	_							
DATE	-	CAROL R. EDMEAD, J.S.C.						
CHECK ONE:	х	CASE DISPOSED				NON-FINAL DISPOSITION		
		GRANTED	Х	DENIED		GRANTED IN PART		OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER				SUBMIT ORDER		
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		INCLUDES TRANSF	ER/RE	ASSIGN		FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT		REFERENCE