

Geron v Haber
2022 NY Slip Op 32428(U)
July 21, 2022
Supreme Court, New York County
Docket Number: Index No. 800432/2011
Judge: Sabrina Kraus
Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op <u>30001</u> (U), are republished from various New York State and local government sources, including the New York State Unified Court System's eCourts Service.
This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

PRESENT:	<u>HON. SABRINA KRAUS</u>	PART	57TR
	<i>Justice</i>		
-----X		INDEX NO.	<u>800432/2011</u>
YONN GERON, AS CHAPTER 7 BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE OF THE ESTATE OF IONA FREEMAN,			07/08/2022, 07/08/2022,
	Plaintiff,	MOTION DATE	<u>07/08/2022</u>
	- v -	MOTION SEQ. NO.	<u>018 019 020</u>
GREGORY HABER, DAVID ROBBINS, CHRISTOPHER GOSTOUT, LENOX HILL HOSPITAL,		DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION	
	Defendant.		

Zelman told the Court that she wanted to consult her own doctor in Long Island and would not consult a physician in Manhattan.

Later that afternoon, Ms. Zelman's paralegal told the Court that Ms. Zelman was hospitalized for testing and would be unable to proceed with trial the next day, Thursday March 3, 2022. A continuance was granted and the trial adjourned to Monday March 7.

On Friday afternoon, March 4, 2022, Dr. Ragone wrote to the court on behalf of Ms. Zelman and stated she would be incapable of proceeding with trial on Monday March 7, 2022, and that her ability to proceed after that date would depend upon her test results and clinical condition.

On Monday morning, March 7, 2022, Alan H. Figman, Esq., an attorney who has an office in the same suite as Ms. Zelman, appeared in Court to request a mistrial on her behalf. Mr. Figman represented to the Court that Ms. Zelman went directly from court to St. Francis Hospital on Long Island on Wednesday March 2 where she stayed overnight. Mr. Figman was told that Ms. Zelman had seen a doctor, went through a battery of neurological tests to determine if she had a TIA or a stroke, and that she was still experiencing unidentified neurological symptoms and could not proceed with trial.

Mr. Figman could not give the Court details as to when Ms. Zelman would be prepared to proceed. The Court reached out to Dr. Ragone but was first told he was with a patient and would call back, and then later told in fact he had not been in the office at all that day. The court had no choice but to declare a mistrial and disband the jury. The court additionally vacated the note of issue.

Under current calendar management rules, the trial courts have essentially four options when a case is called for trial and one or more of the parties fails to appear or for some reason is unable to proceed. The trial court has the discretion to (1) adjourn the trial to another date,(2)

mark the case “off” or strike it from the calendar pursuant to CPLR 3404, (3) vacate the note of issue pursuant to Uniform Rules for Trial Courts (22 NYCRR 202.21[e]), or (4) dismiss the complaint or strike the answer pursuant to Uniform Rules for Trial Courts (22 NYCRR 202.27).

Basetti v. Nour, 287 A.D.2d 126, 133 (2001).

In this action the court granted plaintiff’s application for a mistrial because plaintiff’s counsel alleged she was unable to proceed due to unidentified health reasons. The court also vacated the Note of Issue pursuant to 22 NYCRR 202.21[e].

In order to reinstate the note of issue plaintiff’s counsel was required to move for reinstatement in accordance with 22 NYCRR 202.21(f) which provides:

Reinstatement of note of issue. Motions to reinstate notes of issue vacated pursuant to this section shall be supported by a proper and sufficient certificate of readiness and by an affidavit by a person having first-hand knowledge showing that there is merit to the action, satisfactorily showing the reasons for the acts or omissions which led to the note of issue being vacated, stating meritorious reasons for its reinstatement and showing that the case is presently ready for trial.

N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 22, § 202.21.

Plaintiff’s counsel failed to comply with this requirement and instead just filed a new note of issue. It is for this reason that the motions to vacate the note of issue are granted.

Additionally, this Court still has no clear understanding of what, if any, physical ailment prevented counsel for plaintiff from moving forward with the trial after the continuance granted plaintiff initially, nor whether counsel for plaintiff is physically capable of trying this action at this time. Any motion to reinstate the note of issue should address these issues.

ORDERED that the motion to vacate the note of issue is granted and the note of issue is vacated and the case is stricken from the trial calendar; and it is further

ORDERED that, within 15 days from the entry of this order, movants shall serve a copy of this order with notice of entry on all parties and upon the Clerk of the General Clerk's Office (60 Centre Street, Room 119), who is hereby directed to strike the case from the trial calendar and make all required notations thereof in the records of the court; and it is further

ORDERED that the plaintiff shall move to reinstate the note of issue as provided in Uniform Rule 202.21(f); and it is further

ORDERED that any relief not expressly addressed has nonetheless been considered and is hereby denied; and it is further

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

7/21/2022

DATE

CHECK ONE:

☐

CASE DISPOSED

☐

GRANTED

☐

DENIED

APPLICATION:

☐

SETTLE ORDER

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:

☐

INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

☒

NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

☒

GRANTED IN PART

☐

OTHER

☐

SUBMIT ORDER

☐

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

☐

REFERENCE

202207211611285BKRAUSCS5B9EF2ADC604BD69BB9EF615D2DA0B0

SABRINA KRAUS, J.S.C.