

**Afi v Randolphe**

2011 NY Slip Op 31070(U)

March 24, 2011

Supreme Court, Queens County

Docket Number: 27417/08

Judge: Howard G. Lane

Republished from New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service.  
Search E-Courts (<http://www.nycourts.gov/ecourts>) for any additional information on this case.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.



the submission of evidentiary proof in admissible form, that plaintiff has not suffered a "serious injury." (Lowe v. Bennett, 122 AD2d 728 [1st Dept 1986], affd, 69 NY2d 701, 512 NYS2d 364 [1986]). When a defendant's motion is sufficient to raise the issue of whether a "serious injury" has been sustained, the burden shifts and it is then incumbent upon the plaintiff to produce prima facie evidence in admissible form to support the claim of serious injury (Licari v. Elliot, supra; Lopez v. Senatore, 65 NY2d 1017 [1985]).

In support of a claim that plaintiff has not sustained a serious injury, a defendant may rely either on the sworn statements of the defendant's examining physician or the unsworn reports of plaintiff's examining physician (Pagano v. Kingsbury, 182 AD2d 268 [2d Dept 1992]). Once the burden shifts, it is incumbent upon plaintiff, in opposition to defendant's motion, to submit proof of serious injury in "admissible form". Unsworn reports of plaintiff's examining doctor or chiropractor will not be sufficient to defeat a motion for summary judgment (Grasso v. Angerami, 79 NY2d 813 [1991]). Thus, a medical affirmation or affidavit which is based on a physician's personal examination and observations of plaintiff, is an acceptable method to provide a doctor's opinion regarding the existence and extent of a plaintiff's serious injury (O'Sullivan v. Atrium Bus Co., 246 AD2d 418 [1st Dept 1998]). Unsworn MRI reports are not competent evidence unless both sides rely on those reports (Gonzalez v. Vasquez, 301 AD2d 438 [1st Dept 2003]; Ayzen v. Melendez, 749 NYS2d 445 [2d Dept 2002]). However, in order to be sufficient to establish a prima facie case of serious physical injury the affirmation or affidavit must contain medical findings, which are based on the physician's own examination, tests and observations and review of the record rather than manifesting only the plaintiff's subjective complaints. It must be noted that a chiropractor is not one of the persons authorized by the CPLR to provide a statement by affirmation, and thus, for a chiropractor, only an affidavit containing the requisite findings will suffice (see, CPLR 2106; Pichardo v. Blum, 267 AD2d 441 [2d Dept 1999]; Feintuch v. Grella, 209 AD2d 377 [2d Dept 2003]).

In any event, the findings, which must be submitted in a competent statement under oath (or affirmation, when permitted) must demonstrate that plaintiff sustained at least one of the categories of "serious injury" as enumerated in Insurance Law § 5102(d) (Marquez v. New York City Transit Authority, 259 AD2d 261 [1st Dept 1999]; Tompkins v. Budnick, 236 AD2d 708 [3d Dept 1997]; Parker v. DeFontaine, 231 AD2d 412 [1st Dept 1996]; DiLeo v. Blumberg, 250 AD2d 364 [1st Dept 1998]). For example, in Parker, supra, it was held that a medical affidavit, which

demonstrated that the plaintiff's threshold motion limitations were objectively measured and observed by the physician, was sufficient to establish that plaintiff has suffered a "serious injury" within the meaning of that term as set forth in Article 51 of the Insurance Law. In other words, "[a] physician's observation as to actual limitations qualifies as objective evidence since it is based on the physician's own examinations." Furthermore, in the absence of objective medical evidence in admissible form of serious injury, plaintiff's self-serving affidavit is insufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (Fisher v. Williams, 289 AD2d 288 [2d Dept 2001]).

## **DISCUSSION**

**A. Defendant established a prima facie case that plaintiff, Reginald G. Woel did not suffer a "serious injury" as defined in Section 5102(d).**

The affirmed report of defendant's independent examining orthopedist, Isaac Cohen, M.D., indicates that an examination conducted on July 7, 2010 revealed a diagnosis of: resolved low back and cervical strain. He opines that plaintiff has a completely normal functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system without any evidence of sequelae or permanency related to the accident. He further opines that the physical examination is completely normal without any evidence of sequelae or active disability. Dr. Cohen concludes that no evidence of permanency related to this accident can be documented.

The aforementioned evidence amply satisfied defendant's initial burden of demonstrating that plaintiff did not sustain a "serious injury." Thus, the burden then shifted to plaintiff to raise a triable issue of fact that a serious injury was sustained within the meaning of the Insurance Law (see, Gaddy v. Eyler, 79 NY2d 955 [1992]). Failure to raise a triable issue of fact requires the granting of summary judgment and dismissal of the complaint (see, Licari v. Elliott, supra).

**B. Plaintiff fails to raise a triable issue of fact**

In opposition to the motion, plaintiff submitted: an attorney's affirmation, a sworn narrative report of plaintiff's physician, Zalamn Starosta, M.D., and a portion of plaintiff's own examination before trial transcript testimony.

Plaintiff submitted no proof of objective findings

contemporaneous with the accident. The only admissible medical proof submitted by plaintiff is the affirmed narrative report of plaintiff's physician, Zalman Starosta, M.D. who evaluated plaintiff only one time, on November 26, 2010, almost 2¾ years after the accident. Plaintiff failed to submit any medical proof that was contemporaneous with the accident showing any bulges, herniations, or range of motion limitations (Pajda v. Pedone, 303 AD2d 729 [2d Dept 2003]). Plaintiff has failed to establish a causal connection between the accident and the injuries. The causal connection must ordinarily be established by competent medical proof (see, Kociocek v. Chen, 283 AD2d 554 [2d Dept 2001]; Pommels v. Perez, 4 NY3d 566 [2005]). An examination almost 2¾ years after the accident is insufficient to establish a causal connection between the accident and the injuries. Additionally, other than the initial evaluation examination of plaintiff almost 2¾ after the accident, the record is devoid of any competent evidence of plaintiff's treatment or need for treatment.

Furthermore, in his narrative report, Dr. Zalman states that he reviewed medical records and MRI's of other doctors, however, no medical records or MRI reports have been submitted to the court in competent and admissible form. The probative value of Dr. Starosta's affidavit is reduced by the doctor's reliance on MRI's and medical records that are not in the record before the court. Since Dr. Starosta's conclusions improperly rested on another expert's work product, it is insufficient to raise a material triable factual issue (see, Constantinou v. Surinder, 8 AD3d 323 [2d Dept 2004]; Claude v. Clements, 301 AD2d 432 [2d Dept 2003]; Dominguez-Gionta v. Smith, 306 AD2d 432 [2d Dept 2003]; Codrington v. Ahmad, 40 AD3d 799 [2d Dept 2007]).

Furthermore, plaintiff's attorney's affirmation is not admissible probative evidence on medical issues, as plaintiff's attorney has failed to demonstrate personal knowledge of the plaintiff's injuries (Sloan v. Schoen, 251 AD2d 319 [2d Dept 1998]).

Moreover, plaintiff's self-serving deposition statements are "entitled to little weight" and are insufficient to raise triable issues of fact (see, Zoldas v Louise Cab Corp., 108 AD2d 378, 383 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept 1985]; Fisher v. Williams, 289 AD2d 288 [2d Dept 2001]).

Therefore, plaintiff's submissions are insufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (see, Zuckerman v. City of New York, 49 NY2d 557 [1980]).

Accordingly, the defendant's motion for summary is granted

in its entirety and the plaintiff, Reginald G. Woel's Complaint is dismissed.

The clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

Movant shall serve a copy of this order with Notice of Entry upon the other parties of this action and on the clerk. If this order requires the clerk to perform a function, movant is directed to serve a copy upon the appropriate clerk.

The foregoing constitutes the decision and order of this Court.

Dated: March 24, 2011

.....  
**Howard G. Lane, J.S.C.**