

Bhoge v E&J Car and Limo Serv. Inc.

2014 NY Slip Op 30213(U)

January 13, 2014

Sup Ct, Queens County

Docket Number: 4990/12

Judge: Howard G. Lane

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(U), are republished from various state and local government websites. These include the New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service, and the Bronx County Clerk's office.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

Short Form Order

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT - QUEENS COUNTY

Present: **HONORABLE HOWARD G. LANE**
Justice

IAS PART 6

CHET BHOGE,

 Plaintiff,

 -against-

E&J CAR AND LIMO SERVICE INC. and
OLIVER RAHMAN,
 Defendants.

Index No. 4990/12

Motion
Date November 13, 2013

Motion
Cal. No. 16

Motion
Sequence No. 1

| | <u>Papers Numbered</u> |
|---|----------------------------|
| Notice of Motion-Affidavits-Exhibits... | 1-5 |
| Opposition..... | 6-8 |
| Reply..... | 9-10 |

Upon the foregoing papers it is ordered that this motion by defendants for summary judgment dismissing the complaint of plaintiff, Chet Bhoge, pursuant to CPLR 3212, on the ground that plaintiff has not sustained a serious injury within the meaning of the Insurance Law § 5102(d) is decided as follows:

This action arises out of an automobile accident that occurred on January 7, 2012. Defendants have submitted proof in admissible form in support of the motion for summary judgment, for all categories of serious injury. The defendants submitted *inter alia*, affirmed reports from two independent examining and/or evaluating physicians (an orthopedist and a neuroradiologist) and plaintiff's own examination before trial transcript testimony.

APPLICABLE LAW

Under the "no-fault" law, in order to maintain an action for personal injury, a plaintiff must establish that a "serious injury" has been sustained (Licari v. Elliot, 57 NY2d 230 [1982]). The proponent of a motion for summary judgment must

tender sufficient evidence to show the absence of any material issue of fact and the right to judgment as a matter of law (*Alvarez v. Prospect Hospital*, 68 NY2d 320 [1986]; *Winegrad v. New York Univ. Medical Center*, 64 NY2d 851[1985]). In the present action, the burden rests on defendants to establish, by 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[3rd 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. Defendants established a prima facie case that plaintiff did not suffer a "serious injury" as defined in Section 5102(d), for all categories.

The affirmed report of defendants' independent examining orthopedist, Christopher J. Cassels, M.D., indicates that an examination conducted on May 8, 2013 revealed: "no objective evidence of permanent disability. There are no significant objective abnormal findings of note on clinical examination. There are no objective findings to substantiate the claimant's subjective complaints. It is my firm opinion that the claimant has no functional disability, no permanency, and is fully functional to perform all normal daily activities including work without restrictions."

The affirmed report of defendants' independent evaluating neuroradiologist, Jeffrey N. Lang, M.D., indicates that an MRI of the Left Shoulder dated February 20, 2012 indicates: a normal MRI of the left shoulder with no posttraumatic findings and no findings related to the subject accident.

The affirmed report of defendants' independent evaluating neuroradiologist, Jeffrey N. Lang, M.D., indicates that an MRI of the Cervical Spine dated February 27, 2012 indicates: a normal MRI of the cervical spine with no posttraumatic findings and no findings related to the accident.

The affirmed report of defendants' independent evaluating neuroradiologist, Jeffrey N. Lang, M.D., indicates that an MRI of the Lumbosacral Spine dated March 5, 2012 indicates: a normal MRI of the lumbosacral spine with no posttraumatic findings and no findings related to the subject accident.

Additionally, defendants established a prima facie case for the category of "90/180 days." The plaintiff's examination before trial transcript testimony indicates that there was no period of time for the first three months after the accident that he was confined solely to his bed or home. Such evidence shows that the plaintiff was not curtailed from nearly all activities for the bare minimum of 90/180, required by the statute.

The aforementioned evidence amply satisfied defendants' 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 raises a triable issue of fact

In opposition to the motion, plaintiff submitted: an attorney's affirmation; plaintiff's own affidavit; sworn narrative reports of plaintiff's physician, Iqbal Merchant, M.D., a sworn narrative report of plaintiff's physician, Megha Arvind Manik, M.D.; an affirmation of plaintiff's physician, Robert Donadt, M.D.; and an affirmation of plaintiff's physician, Brian Haftel, M.D.

A medical affirmation or affidavit which is based upon a physician's personal examinations and observation 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, 688 NYS2d 167 (1st Dept. 1980)). 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]). Plaintiff submitted medical proof that was contemporaneous with the accident showing range of motion limitations of the left shoulder (Pajda v. Pedone, 303 AD2d 729 [2d Dept 2003]). Plaintiff has established a causal connection between the accident and the left shoulder injuries. The affirmation submitted by plaintiff's treating physician, Dr. Robert Donadt, sets forth the objective examination, tests, and review of medical records which were performed contemporaneously with the accident to support his conclusion that the plaintiff suffered

from significant injuries, to wit: loss of range of motion of the left shoulder. Dr. Donadt's affirmation details plaintiff's symptoms, including left shoulder pain. He further opines that the left shoulder injuries sustained by the plaintiff in the accident were causally related to the motor vehicle accident of January 7, 2012. Furthermore, plaintiff has provided a recent medical examination detailing the status of his injuries at the current point in time (Kauderer v. Penta, 261 AD2d 365 [2d Dept 1999]). The affirmation of Dr. Donadt provides that a recent examination by Dr. Donadt on August 29, 2013 sets forth the objective examination, tests, and review of medical records which were performed to support his conclusion that the plaintiff suffers from significant injuries, to wit: range of motion limitations in the left shoulder. He further opines that the injuries are permanent in nature, significant, causally related to the motor vehicle accident of January 7, 2012, and result in a permanent limitation in the plaintiff's range of motion of the left shoulder. Clearly, the plaintiffs' experts' conclusions are not based solely on the plaintiff's subjective complaints of pain, and therefore are sufficient to defeat the motion (DiLeo v. Blumber, supra, 250 AD2d 364, 672 NYS2d 319 [1st Dept 1998]).

Since there are triable issues of fact regarding whether the plaintiff sustained a serious injury to his left shoulder, plaintiff is entitled to seek recovery for all injuries allegedly incurred as a result of the accident (Marte v. New York City Transit Authority, 59 AD3d 398 [2d Dept 2009]).

Also, the plaintiff has come forward with sufficient evidence to create an issue of fact as to whether the plaintiff sustained a medically-determined injury which prevented him from performing substantially all of the material acts which constituted her usual and customary daily activities for not less than 90 of the 180 days immediately following the underlying accident (Savatarre v. Barnathan, 280 AD2d 537 [2d Dept 2001]). The record must contain objective or credible evidence to support the plaintiff's claim that the injury prevented plaintiff from performing substantially all of his customary activities (Watt v. Eastern Investigative Bureau, Inc., 273 AD2d 226 [2d Dept 2000]). When construing the statutory definition of a 90/180-day claim, the words "substantially all" should be construed to mean that the person has been prevented from performing his usual activities to a great extent, rather than some slight curtailment (see, Gaddy v. Eyler, 79 NY2d 955; Licari v Elliott, 57 NY2d 230 [1982]; Berk v. Lopez, 278 AD2d 156 [1st Dept 2000], lv denied 96 NY2d 708 [2001]). Plaintiff includes the affirmation of Dr. Donadt which renders an opinion on the effect the injuries claimed may have had on the plaintiff for the 180-day period immediately following the accident, in that he states that: "the

injuries as diagnosed will inhibit his ability to carry out his normal activities of daily living including the use of the left shoulder." As such, plaintiff's submissions were sufficient to establish a triable issue of fact as to whether plaintiff suffered from a medically determined injury that curtailed him from performing his usual activities for the statutory period (Licari v. Elliott, 57 NY2d 230, 236 [1982]). Accordingly, plaintiff's claim that her injuries prevented him from performing substantially all of the material acts constituting his customary daily activities during at least 90 of the first 180 days following the accident is sufficient to raise a triable issue of fact (see, Graham v Shuttle Bay, 281 AD2d 372 [1st Dept 2001]; Hernandez v. Cerda, 271 AD2d 569 [2d Dept 2000]).

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

Accordingly, the defendants' motion for summary is denied.

This constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

Dated: January 13, 2014

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