

<b>Stein v City of New York</b>
2013 NY Slip Op 31158(U)
May 29, 2013
Supreme Court, New York County
Docket Number: 106600/2011
Judge: Kathryn E. Freed
Republished from New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service. Search E-Courts ( <a href="http://www.nycourts.gov/ecourts">http://www.nycourts.gov/ecourts</a> ) for any additional information on this case.
This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

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

PRESENT: HON. KATHRYN FREED  
JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT  
*Justice*

PART 5

Index Number : 106600/2011  
STEIN, DARREN  
vs.  
CITY OF NEW YORK  
SEQUENCE NUMBER : 001  
DISMISS *S & L # 82*

INDEX NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
MOTION DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
MOTION SEQ. NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The following papers, numbered 1 to \_\_\_\_\_, were read on this motion to/for \_\_\_\_\_

Notice of Motion/Order to Show Cause — Affidavits — Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
Answering Affidavits — Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
Replying Affidavits \_\_\_\_\_ | No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this motion is

**DECIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
ACCOMPANYING DECISION / ORDER**

**FILED**  
MAY 30 2013  
NEW YORK  
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

MOTION/CASE IS RESPECTFULLY REFERRED TO JUSTICE  
FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

Dated: 5-29-13  
MAY 29 2013

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~, J.S.C.

HON. KATHRYN FREED  
JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT

- 1. CHECK ONE: .....  CASE DISPOSED  NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
- 2. CHECK AS APPROPRIATE: ..... MOTION IS:  GRANTED  DENIED  GRANTED IN PART  OTHER
- 3. CHECK IF APPROPRIATE: .....  SETTLE ORDER  SUBMIT ORDER
- DO NOT POST  FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT  REFERENCE

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK: Part 5

-----X  
DARREN STEIN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, THE NEW YORK CITY  
POLICE DEPARTMENT AND JOHN DOES ONE  
THROUGH FIVE,

Defendants.

-----X  
HON. KATHRYN E. FREED:

DECISION/ORDER  
Index No. 106600/2011  
Seq. No. 001

PRESENT:  
Hon. Kathryn E. Freed  
J.S.C.

RECITATION, AS REQUIRED BY CPLR§2219 (a), OF THE PAPERS CONSIDERED IN THE REVIEW OF  
THIS MOTION.

PAPERS

NUMBERED

NOTICE OF MOTION AND AFFIDAVITS ANNEXED.....	<b>FILED</b>
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND AFFIDAVITS ANNEXED.....	
ANSWERING AFFIDAVITS.....	<b>MAY 30 2013</b>
REPLYING AFFIDAVITS.....	
EXHIBITS.....	<b>NEW YORK</b> 3-4
OTHER.....	<b>COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE</b>

UPON THE FOREGOING CITED PAPERS, THIS DECISION/ORDER ON THE MOTION IS AS FOLLOWS:

Defendants, hereinafter, "the City," moves for an Order pursuant to CPLR§3211(a)(7) and/or  
CPLR§3212, dismissing plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim as well as his claim for punitive  
damages. No opposition has been received.

After a review of the instant motion, all relevant statutes and case law, the Court **grants** said  
motion.

Factual and procedural background:

According to defendant, on December 30, 2010, plaintiff was arrested for disorderly conduct  
after being escorted out of a Phish concert held at Madison Square Garden in New York County.

In his Summons and Complaint, plaintiff alleges that he was lawfully upon a public sidewalk when he was assaulted and battered by Police Officers' John Doe, thus sustaining physical and emotional injuries. Following this incident, plaintiff served a Notice of Claim on January 24, 2011. He also served a Summons and Complaint on July 6, 2012. Issue was subsequently joined via service of the City's Answer on July 21, 2011.

Defendant's position:

Defendant City argues that plaintiff's Second Cause of Action alleging a 1983 claim against it necessitates dismissal because it is based upon a single, conclusory sentence. Said Second Cause of Action states in pertinent part that "[b]ased upon the foregoing, plaintiff seeks damages for violations of the 28 U.S.C. § 1983 and violations of the Constitution of the State of New York, including but not limited to legal fees for the prosecution of this action." The City also argues that plaintiff has failed to allege a municipal pattern of practice pursuant to which plaintiff's constitutional rights were allegedly violated. The City further argues that plaintiff's claim fails because it is improperly pled in that the City cannot be held liable on a theory of respondeat superior.

Conclusions of law:

It is well settled that "[o]n a motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to CPLR § 3211(a)(7) for failure to state a cause of action, the court must afford the pleading a liberal construction, accept the facts as alleged in the pleading to be true, accord the plaintiff the benefit of every possible inference, and determine only whether the facts as alleged fit within any cognizable legal theory" (Leon v. Martinez, 84 N.Y.2d 83, 87 [1994]; *see also* Guggenheimer v. Ginzburg, 43 N.Y.2d 268, 275 [1977]; Breytman v. Olinville Realty, LLC, 54 A.D.3d 703, 704 [2d Dept. 2008], *lv dismissed* 12 N.Y.3d 878 [2009]; 511 W. 232<sup>nd</sup> Owners Corp. v. Jennifer Realty, Corp., 98 N.Y.2d 144 [2002]).

The only vehicle for an individual to seek a civil remedy for violations of constitutional rights committed under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of any State is a claim brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 ( *see* Vreeburg v. Smith, 192 A.D.2d 41 [2d Dept. 1993] ). In order to assert a claim against a municipality for civil rights violations pursuant to 42 USC §1983 based on the alleged tortious actions of its employees, the plaintiff must allege and plead that the alleged actions resulted from an official municipal policy or custom ( *see* Monell v. Dept. of Social Servs. of City of New York, 436 U.S. 658 [1978]; Leftenant v. City of New York, 70 A.D.3d 596 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2010]; Leung v. City of New York, 216 A.D.2d 10 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 1995]; Chavez v. City of New York, 33 Misc.3d 1214(A), 939 N.Y.2d 739, 2011 N.Y. Slip Op. 5193(U) ( N.Y. Sup. 2011), *affd.* 99 A.D.3d 614 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2010] ).

“The requirement of pleading an official policy or custom of a municipality through which a constitutional injury has been inflicted upon a plaintiff applies only to 42 USC §1983 claims against a local government, and not to such claims against individual defendants in their official capacities” ( Bonsone v. County of Suffolk, 274 A.D.2d 532, 534 [2d Dept. 2000] ). However, “[i]n order to state a claim [against an individual defendant], under that statute, the plaintiff must allege, at a minimum, conduct by a person acting under color of law which deprived the injured party of a right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the Constitution or the laws of the United States” and said claim is subject to dismissal where “no Federally protected right was clearly” alleged ( DiPalma v. Phelan, 91 N.Y.2d 754, 756 [1992] ).

Moreover, to recover on a §1983 claim against a municipality, a plaintiff must specifically plead and prove three elements: 1) an official policy or custom that 2) causes plaintiff to be subjected to and 3) a denial of a constitutional right ( Monell, 432 U.S. 658 at 695 ). Toward this end, liability may be imposed upon a municipality only where the conduct complained of “implements or executes a policy statement, ordinance, regulation, or decision officially adopted and promulgated by that

body's officers" ( Monell, 436 U.S. 658 at 690). Indeed, conclusory assertions are insufficient to assert the necessary elements of a civil rights claim. Furthermore, "a municipality can be found liable under § 1983, only when the municipality itself causes the Constitutional violation" ( City of Canton v. Harris, 489 U.S.378, 385 [1989] citing Monell, 436 U.S.658 at 691 ).

In the case at bar, the Court finds that plaintiff has failed to sufficiently plead the necessary elements which would constitute a §1983 violation. Moreover, plaintiff's claim for punitive damages lacks merit in that the Court of Appeals has consistently held that a municipality is not liable for punitive damages flowing from its employee's alleged misconduct ( Krohn v. New York City Police Dept., 2 N.Y.3d 329, 336 [2004]; Sharapata v. Town of Islip, 56 N.Y.2d 332, 339 [1982]).

Therefore, in accordance with the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that the instant motion to dismiss the complaint herein is granted and said complaint is dismissed in its entirety against the City, with costs and disbursements to the City as taxed by the Clerk of the Court, and the Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly in favor of the City; and it is further


ORDERED that counsel for the moving party shall serve a copy of this order with notice of entry upon the County Clerk ( Room 141B) and the Clerk of the Trial Support Office (Room 158), both located at 60 Centre Street; and it is further

ORDERED that this constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

DATED: May 29, 2013

MAY 29 2013

**FILED**  
 ENTER:  
 MAY 30 2013  
 NEW YORK  
 COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE



Hon. Kathryn E. Freed  
 HON. KATHRYN FREED  
 J.S.C.  
 JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT