## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department

1552

CA 17-00996

PRESENT: WHALEN, P.J., CENTRA, PERADOTTO, LINDLEY, AND WINSLOW, JJ.

V

SEYMOUR H. KNOX, IV, W.A. READ KNOX, AVERY KNOX, HELEN KNOX KEILHOLTZ, OBJECTANTS-RESPONDENTS, ET AL., RESPONDENTS.

HARRIS BEACH PLLC, BUFFALO (RICHARD T. SULLIVAN OF COUNSEL), FOR PETITIONER-APPELLANT.

HOGANWILLIG, PLLC, AMHERST (LINDA LALLI STARK OF COUNSEL), FOR OBJECTANTS-RESPONDENTS.

Appeal from an order of the Surrogate's Court, Erie County (Barbara Howe, S.), entered October 26, 2016. The order, insofar as appealed from, granted that part of the motion of objectants seeking leave to amend their objections to an accounting.

It is hereby ORDERED that the order insofar as appealed from is unanimously reversed on the law without costs and the motion is denied.

Memorandum: Petitioner appeals from an order insofar as it granted that part of the motion of objectants (hereafter, Income Beneficiaries) seeking leave to amend their objections to an accounting to conform to the proof presented during the 2010 trial. We agree with petitioner that Surrogate's Court erred in granting that part of the motion inasmuch as "the proposed amendment is lacking in merit" (Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co. v Reliance Ins. Co., 8 AD3d 1000, 1001 [4th Dept 2004]). The Income Beneficiaries sought to amend their objections to an accounting to assert, verbatim, the objections that were asserted by the guardian ad litem related to the same accounting. We previously determined that those same objections lacked merit (Matter of HSBC Bank USA, N.A. [Knox], 98 AD3d 300 [4th Dept 2012], *Iv dismissed* 20 NY3d 1056 [2013]). Inasmuch as our prior decision is the law of the case, the Surrogate was bound by our decision and erred in granting relief "that was inconsistent with this Court's decision in the prior appeal" (*J.N.K. Mach. Corp. v TBW, Ltd.*, 98 AD3d 1259, 1260 [4th Dept 2012]).