

**Eden Roc, LLLP v Marriott Intl., Inc.**

2014 NY Slip Op 30377(U)

February 6, 2014

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 651027/2012

Judge: Melvin L. Schweitzer

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.

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

PRESENT: MELVIN L. SCHWEITZER  
Justice

PART 45

EDEN ROC

INDEX NO. 651027/2012

MOTION DATE \_\_\_\_\_

- v -

MOTION SEQ. NO. 006

MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC. et al

MOTION CAL. NO. \_\_\_\_\_

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

Notice of Motion/ Order to Show Cause – Affidavits – Exhibits ...

PAPERS NUMBERED

Answering Affidavits – Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_

Replying Affidavits \_\_\_\_\_

Cross-Motion:  Yes  No

Upon the foregoing papers, it is ordered that this motion *by defendants for leave to*

*reargue is GRANTED, and upon reargument, the thirteen causes of action for an accounting is DISMISSED per the attached Decision and Order.*

Dated: February 6, 2014

Melvin L. Schweitzer  
MELVIN L. SCHWEITZER J.S.C.

Check one:  FINAL DISPOSITION  NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

Check if appropriate:  DO NOT POST  REFERENCE

SUBMIT ORDER/JUDG.

SETTLE ORDER /JUDG.

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



memorandum of law consisting of 35 pages with 14 footnotes, and referenced this footnote 9 in footnote 6 in its reply memorandum. Eden Roc responded to it in footnote 10 in its opposition memorandum, arguing that “[b]ecause the Amended Complaint supports the conclusion that Renaissance [Renaissance Hotel Management Company, LLC] has a fiduciary duty to Eden Roc, the Court should also deny Defendants motion to dismiss the Thirteenth Cause of Action for an accounting (which they make in footnote 9 of their Memorandum of Law).” Nevertheless, the argument was made, and, therefore, this situation comes within the parameters of the remedy afforded by CPLR 2221 (d) (2) (*see e.g. Martin v Portexit Corp.*, 98 AD3d at 65; *Cuomo v Ferran*, 77 AD3d 698, 700-701 [2d Dept 2010], *lv dismissed* 16 NY3d 759 [2011]; *Ickes v Buist*, 68 AD3d 823, 824 [2d Dept 2009]).

Eden Roc asserts that a “motion for reargument ‘is not a vehicle permitting a previously unsuccessful party to once again argue the very questions previously decided or to assert new, never previously offered arguments,’” quoting *Kent v 534 E. 11th St.* (80 AD3d 106, 116 [1st Dept 2010]). This assertion is without merit. The basis for the reargument motion is that the court overlooked Marriott’s argument in support of dismissal of the accounting cause of action. Thus, Marriott is neither “once again argu[ing] the questions previously decided” nor asserting “new, never previously offered arguments.”

Turning to the merits, the thirteenth cause of action of the amended complaint alleges that defendants undertook to operate and manage the Eden Roc Renaissance Hotel (Hotel) solely for the account of Eden Roc, exercising exclusive control over the Hotel’s revenue, assets, and books and records. Eden Roc claims that, as the Hotel’s owner, it is entitled to an accounting of all Hotel assets (amended complaint, ¶ 228). The claim for an accounting is dismissed, however,

because of the dismissal of the fiduciary duty claim (ninth cause of action) (*see CIFG Assur. N. Am., Inc. v Goldman, Sachs & Co.*, 106 AD3d 437, 438 [1st Dept 2013] [accounting claim “dismissed for lack of a predicate fiduciary relationship”], citing *Bradkin v Leverton*, 26 NY2d 192, 198 n 4 [1970] [considering absence of a “fiduciary relationship between the plaintiff and the defendant, the plaintiff has no right to the accounting sought by the second cause of action”]; *see also Eden v St. Luke’s-Roosevelt Hosp. Ctr.*, 96 AD3d 614, 615 [1st Dept 2012] [“breach of fiduciary duty and accounting causes of action fail against all defendants, because there was no fiduciary relationship between plaintiff and any of them”]; *Sergeants Benevolent Assn. Annuity Fund v Renck*, 19 AD3d 107, 111 [1st Dept 2005] [“[s]ince the complaint sufficiently alleges a breach of fiduciary duty [regarding] property in which plaintiff has an interest, [accounting claim] should also be reinstated”]).

The parties’ relationship is governed by contract which, according to the amended complaint, provides Eden Roc with the right to obtain financial information. For example, paragraph 132 of the amended complaint cites article 11.11 of the “Management Agreement,” dated September 28, 2000, between Eden Roc’s predecessor-in-interest and Renaissance, which:

“imposes upon Renaissance a series of obligations upon ‘Termination,’ including, without limitation, the obligation to (i) release and transfer to Eden Roc of all of Eden Roc’s funds held or controlled by Renaissance; (ii) make available to Eden Roc all financial books and records relating to the Hotel; (iii) assign to Eden Roc all operating licenses and permits; and (iv) provide Eden Roc with a list of all account debtors, advance bookings at the Hotel, and such other information as Eden Roc reasonably requires to ensure the continued orderly operation of the Hotel.”

Moreover, in its opposition memorandum (page 4), Eden Roc alleges that, under the Management Agreement, Marriott was contractually obligated to:

- (1) Deliver within 20 days after the close of each accounting period an interim accounting showing gross revenues, operating profit, and applications and distributions thereof for the preceding accounting period;
- (2) Transfer any interim amounts due to Eden Roc with each accounting period;
- (3) Deliver an annual operating statement within 75 days of the fiscal year;
- (4) Permit Eden Roc to examine books of control and account pertaining to operations at the Hotel; and
- (5) Permit Eden Roc to audit, examine, or review the annual operating statement.

In opposition, Eden Roc states: “However, as this Court properly held in denying Marriotts’ motion to dismiss Eden Roc’s accounting cause of action, *a fiduciary relationship is not a prerequisite to an accounting action*” (emphasis in original) (memorandum in opposition at 2). This is not so. Nowhere in the decision on the Prior Motion did the court state that “a fiduciary relationship is not a prerequisite to an accounting action.”

Defendants’ cited authority for the proposition that it is entitled to an accounting because of the existence of an alleged confidential relationship between the parties is unpersuasive. Eden Roc cites three decisions in support of this proposition. In *Palazzo v Palazzo* (121 AD2d 261 [2d Dept 1986]), the Court found that the parties had a confidential relationship by virtue of being husband and wife and joint owners of brownstone apartment buildings, thereby entitling the wife to an accounting of the rents and profits in their divorce proceeding. Here, and in contrast, the parties’ relationship is governed by contract.

Eden Roc cites *Boyle v Wegman* (25 Misc 2d 193 [Sup Ct, NY County 1960]) for the proposition that “a contract between a principal and independent contractor gives rise to an

accounting cause of action where one party controls the financial accounts of the other” (memorandum in opposition at 3). In that decision, the court found that, by the express terms of the parties’ contract, “the defendants were required to make accountings and to permit audits so as to determine the compensation” (*id.* at 198). Similarly, as discussed above, Eden Roc contends that it is entitled to financial information pursuant to the Management Agreement. But in the absence of a fiduciary or confidential relationship, Eden Roc is not entitled to maintain a cause of action for an accounting. Moreover, that 1960 trial court decision is not binding on this court, unlike the recent Court of Appeals and First Department decisions cited above.


The same is true for *Scaglione v Castle Restoration Constr. Inc.* (2009 NY Slip Op 31257[u], 2009 NY Misc LEXIS 5793 [May 29, 2009 Sup Ct, Queens County]), also cited by Eden Roc. There, in denying the motion to dismiss the accounting cause of action, the court stated that “the allegations that defendant agreed to pay a percentage of gross revenues to plaintiff in reliance on an agreement, express or implied, may support a finding that defendant owed plaintiff a fiduciary obligation with respect to the allotted percentage of gross revenues.” Besides being nonbinding, that decision, involving an employer-employee relationship, is not relevant to the facts presented here.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the motion for reargument is granted, and upon reargument, the thirteenth cause of action for an accounting is dismissed.

Dated: February 6, 2014

ENTER:

  
J.S.C.  
MELVIN L. SCHWEITZER