

V.M. v City of New York
2023 NY Slip Op 31488(U)
April 28, 2023
Supreme Court, New York County
Docket Number: Index No. 950193/2021
Judge: Alexander M. Tisch
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.

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

PRESENT: HON. ALEXANDER M. TISCH

PART

18

Justice

V. M.,

Plaintiff,

- v -

CITY OF NEW YORK, THE NEW YORK FOUNDLING F/K/A
THE NEW YORK FOUNDLING HOSPITAL,
ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, CATHOLIC CHARITIES
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, SISTERS OF
CHARITY OF SAINT VINCENT DE PAUL OF NEW YORK
A/K/A SISTERS OF CHARITY NEW YORK, DOES 1-10

Defendant.

**DECISION + ORDER ON
MOTION**

INDEX NO. 950193/2021

MOTION DATE N/A

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 20
were read on this motion to/for MISCELLANEOUS

Upon the foregoing documents, plaintiff moves for leave to proceed anonymously.

Plaintiff argues that allowing plaintiff to proceed under a pseudonym would spare plaintiff from the stigmatization and potential embarrassment that may arise as the result of the adjudication of this matter in a public forum. Plaintiff, like other similarly situated plaintiffs, is especially concerned about renewed scrutiny that may ensue due to New York State's enactment of the Child Victims Act (L. 2019 c.11) ("CVA") which, inter alia, (1) extends the statute of limitations on criminal cases involving certain sex offenses against children under 18 (see CPL §30.10 [f]); (2) extends the time which civil actions based upon such criminal conduct may be brought until the child victim reaches 55 years old (see CPLR §208 [b]); and (3) opens a one-year window reviving civil actions for which the statute of limitations has already run (even in cases that were litigated and dismissed on limitations grounds), commencing six months after the effective date of the measure, i.e. August 14, 2019 (see CPLR §214-g). Indeed, plaintiff

maintains that this case is likely to draw attention from the media, and if plaintiff is not allowed to proceed under a pseudonym, increased media attention may lead to a chilling effect that may inhibit plaintiff and other alleged victims of abuse from coming forward. Defendants were duly served with the instant Order to Show Cause, and none submitted opposition.

In general, “[t]he determination of whether to allow a plaintiff to proceed anonymously requires the court to use its discretion in balancing plaintiff’s privacy interest against the presumption in favor of open trials and against any prejudice to defendant” (*Anonymous v. Lerner*, 124 AD3d 487, 487 [1st Dept 2015] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted]; see *J. Doe No. 1 v. CBS Broadcasting, Inc.*, 24 AD3d 215 [1st Dept 2005]; see also *Doe v. Szul Jewelry, Inc.*, 2008 NY Slip Op 31382 [U] [Sup Ct, NY County 2008]). Among the recognized values of open access to civil proceedings is that “the bright light cast upon the judicial process by public observation diminishes the possibilities for injustice, incompetence, perjury, and fraud” (*Danco Labs. v. Chemical Works of Gedeon Richter*, 274 AD2d 1, 7, [1st Dept 2000]). Likewise, the very openness of the process should provide the public “with a more complete understanding of the judicial system and a better perception of its fairness” and serves to “ensure that the proceedings are conducted efficiently, honestly and fairly” (*Danco*, 274 AD2d at 7, *supra*).

However, the right of the public, and the press, to access judicial proceedings is not absolute or unfettered, and involves judicial discretion (*Lerner*, 124 AD3d at 487, *supra*). Moreover, access may still be respected in keeping with constitutional requirements while sensitive information is restricted in keeping with “the State’s legitimate concern for the well-being” of an individual (*Globe Newspaper Co. v. Superior Ct.*, 457 U.S. 596, 606 [1982]). A plaintiff’s privacy interests, although not recognized under New York State’s common law, are found in the Civil Rights Law (“CRL”) (see *Stephano v. News Group Publications, Inc.*, 64

NY2d 174, 182 [1984]; *Arrington v. New York Times Co.*, 55 NY2d 433, 440 [1982]). Indeed, pursuant to CRL §50-b “The identity of any victim of a sex offense, as defined in article one hundred thirty or section 255.25, 255.26, or 255.27 of the penal law, or of an offense involving the alleged transmission of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus, shall be confidential....”

However, this statute does not apply to everyone claiming to have been the victim of a sexual assault. Rather, the statute was enacted to spare victims of sexual assault the embarrassment of being publicly identified in the news media and to encourage such victims to cooperate in the prosecution of sexual offenses (see New York Bill Jacket, 1999 S.B. 5539, Ch. 643). Courts have afforded victims of sexual offenses protection under CRL §50-b where there has either been an arrest and prosecution, or there is an investigation (see *People v. McDaniel*, 81 NY2d 10 [1993]). In addition, while “[i]t is elementary that the primary function of a pleading is to apprise an adverse party of the pleader's claim” the same does not necessarily apply to a pleader's name (*Cole v. Mandell Food Stores, Inc.*, 93 NY2d 34, 40 [1999] [emphasis added]).

The instant case involves alleged acts that will no doubt center on information about plaintiff of a sensitive and highly personal nature. The court recognizes that plaintiff, as the alleged victim of sexual abuse, alleges that plaintiff has suffered great emotional distress. In contrast, defendants are largely institutions, and therefore are not prejudiced at this time. Revelation of plaintiff's name could unsettle plaintiff and perhaps deter plaintiff from litigating this matter. Such an outcome would undoubtedly undermine the very purpose for which the CVA was enacted. Notably, a grant of anonymity by this court impacts far less on the public's right to open proceedings than does the actual closing of a courtroom or the sealing of records – issues that are presently not before this court. In this court's view the public ultimately has an interest in seeing this case determined on its merits, after the parties have had an opportunity to

fully and properly litigate the issues presented. Anonymity, at this juncture, will preserve the integrity of that stated objective.

Accordingly, it is, for the reasons stated above, hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to file a complaint and proceed herein under a pseudonym, rather than in plaintiff's legal name, and to proceed throughout this action under such pseudonym, rather than in plaintiff's own name, is granted; and it is further

ORDERED that in accordance with this court's decision and order, the parties are directed to comply with the conditions contained within this court's Case Management Orders; and it is further

ORDERED that the court shall issue a separate notice to the parties regarding a future appearance in this matter. The foregoing constitutes the decision and order of this court.

4/28/2023

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

ALEXANDER M. TISCH, J.S.C.