

De Jesus v Reynoso
2016 NY Slip Op 31103(U)
May 17, 2016
Supreme Court, Bronx County
Docket Number: 23011/2013
Judge: Alison Y. Tuitt
Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op <u>30001</u> (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.

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT-----COUNTY OF BRONX

PART IA - 5

MARIA DE LA CRUZ DE JESUS,

INDEX NUMBER: 23011/2013

Plaintiff,

-against-

Present:

HON. ALISON Y. TUITT

Justice

SIMON REYNOSO, O.J. JESUS DE LA CRUZ
and J.E. DEJESUS CASTILLO,

Defendants.

The following papers numbered 1 to 5

Read on this Defendants' Motion and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment

On Calendar of 8/17/15

Notices of Motion/Cross-Motion-Exhibits and Affirmations 1, 2

Affirmations in Opposition 3, 4

Reply Affirmation 5

Upon the foregoing papers, defendants' motion and cross-motion for summary judgment are consolidated for purposes of this decision. For the reasons set forth herein, the motion and cross-motion are denied for the reasons set forth herein.

The within action arises from a motor vehicle accident on February 16, 2013 in which plaintiff alleges to have sustained serious injuries. Defendants move for summary judgment on the grounds that plaintiff fails to prove a serious injury as required by §5102(d) of the Insurance Law.

The court's function on this motion for summary judgment is issue finding rather than issue determination. Sillman v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., 3 N.Y.2d 395 (1957). Since summary judgment is a drastic remedy, it should not be granted where there is any doubt as to the existence of a triable issue.

Rotuba Extruders v. Ceppos, 46 N.Y.2d 223 (1978). The movant must come forward with evidentiary proof in admissible form sufficient to direct judgment in its favor as a matter of law. Zuckerman v. City of New York, 49 N.Y.2d 557, 562 (1980). Thus, when the existence of an issue of fact is even arguable or debatable, summary judgment should be denied. Stone v. Goodson, 8 N.Y.2d 8, (1960); Sillman v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., *supra*.

The proponent of a motion for summary judgment carries the initial burden of production of evidence as well as the burden of persuasion. Alvarez v. Prospect Hospital, 68 N.Y.2d 320 (1986). Thus, the moving party must tender sufficient evidence to demonstrate as a matter of law the absence of a material issue of fact. Once that initial burden has been satisfied, the "burden of production" (not the burden of persuasion) shifts to the opponent, who must now go forward and produce sufficient evidence in admissible form to establish the existence of a triable issue of fact. The burden of persuasion, however, always remains where it began, i.e., with the proponent of the issue. Thus, if evidence is equally balanced, the movant has failed to meet its burden. 300 East 34th Street Co. v. Habeeb, 683 N.Y.S.2d 175 (1st Dept. 1997).

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, 511 N.Y.S.2d 603 (1st Dept. 1986), *aff'd*, 69 N.Y.2d 701 (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, 57 N.Y.2d 230 (1982); Lopez v. Senatore, 65 N.Y.2d 1017 (1985). When a claim is raised under the "permanent consequential limitation of use of a body organ or member", "significant limitation of use of a body function or system," or "a medically determined injury or impairment of a non-permanent nature which prevents the injured person from performing substantially all of the material acts which constitute such person's usual and customary daily activities for not less than ninety days during the one hundred eighty days immediately following the occurrence of the injury or impairment," in order to prove the extent or degree of physical limitation, an expert's designation of a numeric percentage of a plaintiff's loss of range of motion is acceptable. Toure v. Avis Rent A Car Systems, Inc., 98 N.Y.2d 345 (2002). In addition, an expert's qualitative assessment of a plaintiff's condition is also probative, provided that: (1) the evaluation has an objective basis and, (2) the

evaluation compares the plaintiff's limitations to the normal function, purpose and use of the affected body organ, member, function or system. Toure, supra. ¹

In the instant action, defendants move for summary judgment arguing that plaintiff has not suffered a serious injury pursuant to §5102 of the Insurance Law. Plaintiff alleges to have sustained, in relevant part, left C6 radiculopathy and bilateral mild carpal tunnel syndrome, confirmed by EMG/NCS performed on May 24, 2013; posterior disc bulge at L4-L5 impinging upon the thecal sac, confirmed by MRI performed on April 18, 2013; and, a central posterior disc herniation at C5-C6 impinging upon the thecal sac and narrowing the left sided neural foramen, confirmed by MRI performed on April 18, 2013

The Court finds that the defendants met their prima facie burden of establishing that plaintiff did not sustain a serious injury by submitting the affirmed report of their medical expert Dr. Naunihal Sachdev Singh who, based upon his physical examination of the plaintiff, found full range of motion in the plaintiff's cervical and lumbar spine. Dr. Singh noted that there were no objective neurological findings and any alleged injuries to plaintiff's cervical and lumbar spine had resolved. Defendants also submit the affirmed report of Dr. Audrey Eisenstadt, radiologist, who reviewed plaintiff's MRI films and opines that the cervical spine MRI shows osteophyte formation at C5-6 with disc degeneration and bulging, with no disc herniation or annular tear and the lumbar spine MRI shows dessication at L3-4 and L4-5 which is a degenerative process. Defendants further submit the affirmed report of Stacey Donegan, Board Certified in Emergency Medicine, who reviewed the bill of particulars, police report, EMS report and Emergency Department records and opines that plaintiff's injuries are not supported by plaintiff's own claims to EMS and/or the ER staff and unsupported by their findings and examination. She opines that there were no acute traumatic findings to causally relate to plaintiff's accident and claimed injuries.

In opposition to the motion, plaintiff submits medical records in admissible form setting forth her medical treatments, including physical examinations and therapy, objective diagnostic testing, including MRIs and the affirmed reports and/or affidavit of her treating physician and medical providers. Plaintiff's submissions


¹The Toure decision appears to indicate that claims of neck or back injury resulting from bulging or herniated discs may be considered either under the category of a "permanent consequential limitation of use of a body organ or member" or a "significant limitation of use of a body function or system," as well as the 90/180 day category (Toure v. Avis Rent A Car Systems, Inc., 98 N.Y.2d 345, 352, 774 N.E.2d 1197, 746 N.Y.S.2d 865 [2002].)

raise an issue of fact as to whether she sustained a serious injury as she produced objective, contemporaneous and qualitative medical evidence regarding the injury. See, Blackman v. Dinstuhi, 810 N.Y.S.2d 79 (1st Dept. 2006); Jimenez v. Rojas, 810 N.Y.S.2d (1st Dept. 2006). Moreover, plaintiff's submissions address defendants' contention that plaintiff's injuries are not causally related to the accident, but are degenerative in nature. See, Boone v. Elizabeth Taxi, Inc., 993 N.Y.S.2d 302 (1st Dept. 2014). Furthermore, plaintiff has submitted objective medical evidence such as the MRIs which sufficiently establish the existence of a serious injury. Toure, supra; Brown v. Achy, 776 N.Y.S.2d 56 (1st Dept. 2004). The affirmation of plaintiff's treating physician, which is based on his personal examinations and observations of the plaintiff, are acceptable methods to provide a doctor's opinion regarding the existence and extent of a plaintiff's serious injury. O'Sullivan v. Atrium Bus Co., 668 N.Y.S.2d 167 (1st Dept. 1998). Moreover, Dr. Cabatu's opinion that plaintiff's injuries to her cervical and lumbar spine are causally related to the accident and that plaintiff has sustained permanent limitations to her cervical and lumbar spine and is permanently partially disabled. Furthermore, Dr. Cabatu states that the subject motor vehicle accident is the competent producing cause of the injuries she sustained.

Defendants, however, make a prima facie showing that plaintiff did not sustain a medically determined injury of a nonpermanent nature that prevented him from performing substantially all of her customary and daily activities for 90 of the 180 days immediately following the accident by submitting plaintiff's deposition testimony showing that following the accident, she missed one day from work. See, Uddin v. Cooper, 820 N.Y.S.2d 44 (1st Dept. 2006). Moreover, plaintiff has offered no evidence showing that she was restricted from performing substantially all of the material acts that constituted her usual and customary daily activities for 90 days during the 180 days following the accident. See, Fernandez v. Niamou, 885 N.Y.S.2d 486 (1st Dept. 2009).

This constitutes the decision and Order of this Court.

Dated: 5/17/16



Hon. Alison Y. Tuitt