State of New York

Court of Appeals

Decisions

May 19, 2022

CASES

3 No. 36
Columbia Memorial Hospital,
Appellant,
v.
Marcel E. Hinds,
Respondent.

2 No. 38
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 V.
Joseph Scott, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,

Defendant.

2 No. 39
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 V.
Diana Goldenberg, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,

Defendant.

2 No. 40
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 V.
Diana Arevalo, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,
 Defendant.

Order affirmed, with costs.
Opinion by Judge Wilson.
Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia,
Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary. Opinion by Judge Wilson. Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary. Opinion by Judge Wilson. Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary. Opinion by Judge Wilson. Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur. 2 No. 41
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 v.
Nina Sundaram, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,
 Defendant.

2 No. 42
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 v.
Mario Mutic, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,
 Defendant.

2 No. 43
Maple Medical, LLP,
 Appellant,
 v.
Lisa H. Youkeles, &c.,
 Respondent,
et al.,
 Defendant.

4 No. 61 SSM 9
The People &c.,
Appellant,
v.
Kesean R. McKenzie-Smith,
Respondent.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary.

Opinion by Judge Wilson.

Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia,
Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary. Opinion by Judge Wilson. Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs, and certified question not answered as unnecessary. Opinion by Judge Wilson. Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

On review of submissions pursuant to section 500.11 of the Rules, order reversed and case remitted to the Appellate Division, Fourth Department, for consideration of the facts and issues raised but not determined on appeal to that Court. The Appellate Division erred in holding that defendant's *Antonmarchi* claim (*People v Antonmarchi*, 80 NY2d 247 [1992]) entitled him to a new trial (*see People v Wilkins*, 37 NY3d 371, 380 [2021]). Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Wilson, Singas and Cannataro concur. Judge Troutman took no part.

3 No. 62 SSM 13
Park Avenue Associates in Radiology, P.C.,
Appellant,
v.
Peter Joseph Nicholson,
Respondent,
et al.,
Defendants.

2 No. 51 The People &c., Appellant, v. Luis A. Rodriguez, Respondent.

3 No. 37
Kim E. Schoch,
Respondent,
V.
Lake Champlain OB-GYN, P.C.,
Appellant.

On review of submissions pursuant to section 500.11 of the Rules, order affirmed, with costs (*see Columbia Mem. Hosp. v Hinds*, __ NY3d __ [decided today]). Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia, Wilson, Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

Order reversed and case remitted to the Appellate Division, Second Department, for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion herein.

Opinion by Judge Cannataro.

Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia,
Wilson, Singas and Troutman concur.

Order affirmed, with costs.
Opinion by Judge Wilson.
Chief Judge DiFiore and Judges Rivera, Garcia,
Singas, Cannataro and Troutman concur.

MOTIONS

1 Mo. No. 2022-124 14 East 4th Street Unit 509 LLC, Respondent, v. Michael Toporek,

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed for failure to demonstrate timeliness as required by Rules of the Court of Appeals (*see* 22 NYCRR § 500.22 [b] [2]).

3 SSD 12
In the Matter of Anonymous, &c.,
Appellant.

Appellant.

Appeal dismissed without costs, by the Court *sua sponte*, upon the ground that the order appealed from does not finally determine the proceeding within the meaning of the Constitution.

Mo. No. 2022-282

The People &c., Respondent,

v.

Mamadou Ba, Appellant. Motion for assignment of counsel granted and Janet E. Sabel, Esq., The Legal Aid Society, 199 Water Street, New York, NY 10038 assigned as counsel to the appellant on the appeal herein.

4 Mo. No. 2022-149
The People &c. ex rel. Germaine Brown,
Appellant,
v.
State of New York Department of

State of New York Department of Corrections,

Respondent.

Motion for leave to appeal denied.

2 Mo. No. 2022-213 In the Matter of Marta Bryceland, Appellant, v.

Thomas Gut,

Respondent.

(And Another Proceeding.)

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the proceedings within the meaning of the Constitution.

Motion for poor person relief &c. dismissed as academic.

Mo. No. 2022-246 In the Matter of Hilary C., Appellant, v. Michael K., Respondent. 1 Mo. No. 2022-74 Thomas Caso, Appellant, Miranda Sambursky Slone Sklarin Verveniotis LLP, et al., Respondents, et al., Defendants. Mo. No. 2022-341 The People &c., Respondent, Axel Correra-Robles, Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-135 The People &c., Respondent, v. Steven C. Forshey, Appellant. 1 Mo. No. 2022-145 The People &c., Respondent,

v. Rigoberto Funez,

Appellant.

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the proceeding within the meaning of the Constitution.

Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

Motion for leave to appeal denied.

Motion for an extension of the time within which to apply for permission to appeal pursuant to CPL 460.20 granted and motion papers treated as a timely CPL 460.20 application.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic. 2 Mo. No. 2022-138
The People &c.,
Respondent,
v.
Michael Glosque,
Appellant.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

Mo. No. 2022-258
The People &c.,
 Respondent,
 V.
Angel Gurity, also known as Angel Guridy,
 Appellant.

Motion for an extension of the time within which to apply for permission to appeal pursuant to CPL 460.20 dismissed as untimely.

4 Mo. No. 2022-110
In the Matter of Delbert W. Hargis, Jr.,
Appellant,
v.
Victoria Ann Pritty-Pitcher,
Respondent.
(And Related Proceedings.)

Motion, insofar as it seeks leave to appeal from the Appellate Division order that dismissed the appeal from the December 16, 2020 Family Court order, dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the proceeding within the meaning of the Constitution; motion for leave to appeal otherwise denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic. Judge Troutman took no part.

4 Mo. No. 2022-355
Krystalo Hetelekides, &c.,
Appellant,
v.
County of Ontario et al.,
Respondents.

Motion by Pacific Legal Foundation for leave to file a brief amicus curiae on the appeal herein granted and the proposed brief is accepted as filed. Two copies of the brief must be served, an original and nine copies filed, and the brief submitted in digital format within seven days.

3 Mo. No. 2022-150
In the Matter of Brian Lee Hunt,
Appellant,
V.
Anthony J. Annucci, &c.,
Respondent.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic. 4 Mo. No. 2022-143
The People &c.,
Respondent,
v.
Virgil Johnson,
Appellant.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

4 Mo. No. 2022-106
Norman K., &c.,
Appellant,
v.
Alan Posner, et al.,
Respondents,
et al.,
Defendants.

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the action within the meaning of the Constitution.

Judge Troutman took no part.

1 SSD 13
In the Matter of Julie Lallo,
 Appellant,
 v.
New York City Department of Education,
 Respondent.

Appeal dismissed without costs, by the Court *sua sponte*, upon the ground that no substantial constitutional question is directly involved.

4 Mo. No. 2022-177 In the Matter of LaRae L.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

Onondaga County Department of Children and Family Services,
Respondent;
Heather L.,
Appellant.

Mo. No. 2022-154

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the action within the meaning of the Constitution.

Motion for a stay dismissed as academic.

Olena Lavrenyuk, &c., Respondent, v. Life Care Services, Inc., Appellant.

Mo. No. 2022-121 Motion for leave to appeal denied. In the Matter of Feng Li, Appellant, v. Michael J. Knight, &c., Respondent. Mo. No. 2022-72 Motion for leave to appeal denied. The People &c., Respondent, v. Juan Lopez, Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-188 Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic. In the Matter of Jacieon M. et al. Monroe County Department of Human Services. Respondent; India M., Appellant, et al., Respondent. SSD 14 Appeal dismissed without costs, by the Court sua sponte, upon the ground that no substantial Alan Meckler. constitutional question is directly involved. Respondent, v. David Molner, Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-153 Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from Allison Mitura, does not finally determine the action within the Respondent, meaning of the Constitution. v. Paul Mitura,

Appellant.

Mo. No. 2022-119 Motion for leave to appeal denied. In the Matter of Steven M. Politi, &c., Appellant, v. Fernando Camacho, &c., Respondent. 3 Mo. No. 2022-136 Motion for leave to appeal denied. In the Matter of Stephanie R., Respondent, v. Walter Q., Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-295 Motion for an extension of the time within which to apply for permission to appeal pursuant to CPL The People &c., 460.20 granted and motion papers treated as a timely Respondent, CPL 460.20 application. v. Melbourne Ridge, Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-113 Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from Tracy Ryals, does not finally determine the action within the Appellant, meaning of the Constitution. West 21st Street Properties LLC, Respondent, et al., Defendants. (And a Third-Party Action.)

Mo. No. 2022-116

In the Matter of Brett B. Truett, et al.,

Appellants,

Respondent.

4

v. Oneida County, Motion for leave to appeal denied with one hundred

dollars costs and necessary reproduction

disbursements.

Mo. No. 2021-1010 Motion for leave to appeal denied. In the Matter of the Claim of Jose Urdiales, Appellant, v. Durite Concepts Inc/Durite USA et al., Respondents. Workers' Compensation Board, Respondent. Mo. No. 2021-989 Motion for leave to appeal denied with one hundred dollars costs and necessary reproduction U.S. Bank National Association, &c., disbursements. Appellant, v. Marie Derissaint, &c., Respondent, et al., Defendants. Mo. No. 2022-1 2 Motion for leave to appeal denied. U.S. Bank N.A., &c., Respondent, Gerald Lent, &c., Appellant, et al., Defendants. Mo. No. 2022-117 Motion for leave to appeal denied. The People &c., Respondent, v. Sam Wassilie, Appellant. Mo. No. 2022-131 Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic. The People &c., Respondent,

Dashawn Williams,

Appellant.

3 Mo. No. 2022-241 In the Matter of Jaylynn WW. et al., &c.

Clinton County Department of Social Services,

Respondent;

Justin WW.,

Appellant,

Roxanne WW.,

Respondent.

3 Mo. No. 2022-254

In the Matter of Robert XX.,

Appellant,

v.

Susan YY.,

Respondent.

(And Another Related Proceeding.)

3 Mo. No. 2022-63 In the Matter of Bryce Y. et al., &c.

Columbia County Department of Social Services,

Respondent;

Clint Y.,

Appellant.

Motion for leave to appeal denied.

Motion for leave to appeal denied. Motion for poor person relief dismissed as academic.

Motion for leave to appeal dismissed upon the ground that the order sought to be appealed from does not finally determine the proceeding within the meaning of the Constitution.