SHORT FORM ORDER

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Present:

HON. DANIEL PALMIERI Acting Justice Supreme Court

BETINA FILS-AIME,

TRIAL PART: 50

INDEX NO.:018821/01 ACTION NO. 1

Plaintiff,

 \checkmark

-against-

MOTION DATE:9-15-05 SUBMIT DATE:9-29-05 SEQ. NUMBER - 012

RYDER TRS, INC., MATTHEW D. VERMILYEA, CRISTOFARO SCACCIA, MARIO A. SCACCIA, ERIC Y. DUNST, and SIMMIE DUNST, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, INTEGRAMED AMERICA, INC., MPD MEDICAL ASSOCIATES OF NEW YORK and REPRODUCTIVE SPECIALISTS OF NEW YORK, LLP,

Defendants

---¥

MAGDA JACHOWICZ, an infant, by MACIEJ JACHOWICZ, as parent and natural guardian, HANNA JACHOWICZ, an infant, by MACIEJ JACHOWICZ, as parent and natural guardian and MACIEJ JACHOWICZ, Individually,

Plaintiffs

ACTION NO. 2

-against-

INDEX NO. 2635/02

MATTHEW D. VERMILYEA, RYDER, TRS., INC., CRISTOFARO SCACCIA, MARIO A. SCACCIA, ERIC Y. DUNST and SIMMIE DUNST BETINA FILS-AIME, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, INTEGRAMED AMERICA, INC., MPD MEDICAL ASSOCIATES, OF NEW YORK, and REPRODUCTIVE

SPECIALISTS OF NEW YORK, LLP,

Defendants

____X

-X

MATTHEW D. VERMILYEA Third-Party Plaintiff,

-against-

THIRD-PARTY ACTION

CORNELL UNIVERSITY and UNITED EDUCATORS INSURANCE RISK RETENTION GROUP, INC.

Third-Party Defendants,

The following papers have been read on this motion:

Notice of Motion, dated 8-19-05	1
Affirmation in Opposition, dated 9-8-05	
Affirmation in Opposition, dated 9-14-05	
Affirmation in Opposition, dated 9-21-05	
Affirmation in Reply, dated 9-26-05	_

Upon the foregoing papers it is ordered that this motion by Maciej Jachowicz, as defendant on counterclaims alleged by defendants in action # 2 (index no. 2635/02), for an order pursuant to CPLR 3212 for summary judgment is <u>granted</u> and all such counterclaims are dismissed.

By way of proof annexed to the affirmation of his attorney, the moving defendant has provided *prima facie* proof in admissible form (*see Olan v Farrell Lines*, 64 NY2d 1092) that he is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, shifting the burden to the motion opponents to come forward with evidence demonstrating the existence of issues of fact meriting a trial (see, e.g., Zuckerman v City of New York, 49 NY2d 557, 562). Specifically, the transcript of Jachowicz's deposition indicate that he had been driving on Glen Cove Road, and, at its intersection with Hillside Avenue, was stopped for a light in the right lane. The operator of the vehicle to his left, also stopped, asked him for directions. The light turned green and Jachowicz took his foot off the brake, but did not press the accelerator. He heard the sound of screeching tires, and a loud bang. He held the steering wheel tighter, and heard a second bang on the driver's side. A split second after the second bang his car was struck. This amounts to proof that he took no action that would constitute negligence on his part.

In opposition, the motion opponents raise two issues. The first is that the moving party failed to annex the supplemental summons and (second) amended complaint (of the Jachowicz plaintiffs), but rather an earlier version of the amended complaint which was superseded by the newer pleading. He thus was in technical violation of CPLR 3212(b), which provides that a motion for summary judgment be supported by, among other things, a copy of the pleadings. However, on a motion to dismiss a failure to annex the pleadings may be overlooked by a court if the record is otherwise sufficiently complete (*Welch v Hauck*, 18 AD3d 1096; *see* CPLR 2001) and should not lead to denial in any event but, rather, dismissal of the motion without prejudice to renewal (*Green v Wood*, 6 AD3d 976). As the Court has an ample basis for deciding this motion notwithstanding the presentation of the wrong pleading, and the correct amended complaint was annexed to the movant's reply papers, it will overlook the procedural defect and address the merits.

In that regard, the sole basis presented is that there is some evidence that the infant

plaintiffs in the Jachowicz actions, Hanna and Magda Jachowicz, were not restrained by seat belts, in violation of Vehicle and Traffic Law § 1229-c(1). The statute provides that no person shall operate a motor vehicle unless all back-seat passengers under the age of 16 are restrained by seat belts, and there is no dispute that both infant plaintiffs were under 16 at the time of the accident. Based thereon, the motion opponents contend that their father, the movant herein, was negligent as a matter of law, as he was in violation of the Vehicle and Traffic Law (*see Hellenhecht v Radeber*, 309 AD2d 834).

However, at subdivision (8) section 1299-c also provides that "non-compliance with the provisions of this section shall not be admissible as evidence in any civil action in a court of law in regard to the issue of liability but may be introduced into evidence in mitigation of damages..." (*see also Boyd v Trent*, 297 AD2d 301; *Baker v Kelly*, 241 AD2d 947). As the present motion concerns only the counterclaim defendant's alleged freedom from liability, and the sole evidence sought to be raised to place this in issue is inadmissible, the Court finds that the motion opponents have failed to rebut the *prima facie* showing made by the movant. Accordingly, his motion for summary judgment dismissing the counterclaim must be granted.

This motion was referred to this Court on January 3, 2006.

The foregoing constitutes the Decision and Order of the Court.

DATED: January 17, 2006 ENTERED HO Ac

NASSAU COUNTY

ENTER

HON. DANIEL PALMIERI Acting Supreme Court Justice

Milber Makris Plousadis & Seiden, LLP
 By: Susan J. Stromberg
 Attorneys Third-Party Defendant
 United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc.
 1000 Woodbury Road, Ste. 402
 Woodbury, NY 11797

Of Counsel Thomas S. Schaufelberger, Esq. Paul A. Fitzsimmons, Esq. Wright, Robinson, Osthimer & Tatum 5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 920 Washington, D.C. 20015-2030

Law Office of James E. Toner Attorney for Plaintiff Fils-Aime 114 Old Country Road, Ste. 630 Mineola, NY 11501

Norma W. Schwab, Esq. Attorneys for Cornell University Cornell University 300 CCC Building, Garden Avenue Ithaca, NY 14853-2806

William F. Gormley, Esq. O'Connor, O'Connor, Hintz & Deveney LLP Attorneys for Defendant Matthew D. Vermilyea One Huntington Quadrangle, Ste. 1C07 Melville, NY 11747

Thomas C. Awad, Esq. John T. Ryan & Associates Attorneys for Defendant Integramed America, Inc. One Hollow Lane, Ste. 316 Lake Success, NY 11042 Peter Graff, Esq. Martin, Fallon & Mulle, Esqs. Attorneys for Defendant/Third Party Plaintiffs-Eric Y. Dunst and Simmie Dunst 100 East Carver Street Huntington, NY 11743

Charles Leibowitz, Esq. Law Offices of Robert P. Tusa Attorneys for Plaintiff on the Counter claim-Maciej Jachowicz 1225 Franklin Avenue, Ste. 500 Garden City, NY 11530

Thomas J. McGowan, Esq.
Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein & Breitsone, LLP
Attorneys for MPD Medical Associates, P.C. d/b/a Reproductive Science Assoc.
Of New York and Reproductive Specialists of New York
190 Willis Avenue
Mineola, NY 11501

Anthony J. Montiglio, Esq. 300 Old Country Road Mineola, NY 11501

Jason Nardiello, Esq. Donohoe, McGahan & Catalano, Esqs. Attorneys for Plaintiff action 2 - Magda, Hanna and Maciej Jachowicz 555 North Broadway P.O. Box 350 Jericho, NY 11753

Thomas Pannettieri, Esq. Scott Baron & Associates, P.C. Attorneys for Dunst Action No. 4 159-49 Cross Bay Boulevard Howard Beach, NY 11414

Merle Schrager, Esq. Hammill, O'Brien, Croutier, Dempsey & Pender, P.C. Attorneys for Defendants - Cristofaro & Mario A. Scaccia 138 Mineola Blvd, Box 351 Mineola, NY 11501 Michael V. Scalafani, Esq. Reardon & Scalafani, P.C. Attorneys for Defendant - Ryder Trs., Inc. 220 White Plains Road, Ste. 235 Tarrytown, NY 10591

Isserlis & Sullivan, Esqs. Attorneys for Defendant Betina J. Fils-Aime on Counterclaim 999 Stewart Avenue Bethpage, NY 11714