

M.C. v City of New York
2023 NY Slip Op 32708(U)
July 28, 2023
Supreme Court, New York County
Docket Number: Index No. 950215/2021
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: <u>HON. ALEXANDER M. TISCH</u> <i>Justice</i> -----X M. C., Plaintiff,	PART 18 INDEX NO. <u>950215/2021</u> MOTION DATE <u>11/05/2021</u> MOTION SEQ. NO. <u>002</u>
---	--

- 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 DEPAUL OF NEW YORK
A/K/A SISTERS OF CHARITY NEW YORK, DOES 1-10

**DECISION + ORDER ON
MOTION**

Defendants.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 002) 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40

were read on this motion to/for

DISMISSAL

Upon the foregoing papers, defendants Archdiocese of New York (Archdiocese) and Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York (Catholic Charities) (collectively, defendants or movants) move to dismiss the complaint pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (1) and (7) or, alternatively, pursuant to CPLR 3212.

The complaint alleges as follows: In approximately 1968, plaintiff was placed in foster care by co-defendant the City of New York (City) by and through the New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). Upon information and belief, defendant City by and through ACS entered into an agreement with co-defendant the New York Foundling (Foundling) and Catholic Charities for the placement of plaintiff into foster care and/or for Foundling and/or Catholic Charities to perform foster care services to New York City's children. Approximately in 1968 when plaintiff was about four (4) years old, David Valentin allegedly sexually assaulted and abused plaintiff from about 1968 to 1977. Plaintiff also alleges that she was sexually assaulted and

abused by Nelson Valentin when she was approximately seven (7) years old in or about 1971. The complaint alleges that the abuse took place in the foster residence of the Valentin family home, and that defendants placed plaintiff in the Valentine residence which provided David and Nelson Valentine the opportunity to commit such acts.

In determining dismissal under CPLR Rule 3211 (a) (7), the “complaint is to be afforded a liberal construction” (Goldfarb v Schwartz, 26 AD3d 462, 463 [2d Dept 2006]). The “allegations are presumed to be true and accorded every favorable inference” (Godfrey v Spano, 13 NY3d 358, 373 [2009]). “[T]he sole criterion is whether the pleading states a cause of action, and if from its four corners factual allegations are discerned which taken together manifest any cause of action cognizable at law a motion for dismissal will fail” (Guggenheimer v Ginzburg, 43 NY2d 268, 275 [1977]). Additionally, “[w]hether a plaintiff can ultimately establish its allegations is not part of the calculus in determining a motion to dismiss” (EBC I, Inc. v Goldman, Sachs & Co., 5 NY3d 11, 19 [2005]).

A motion to dismiss a complaint based upon documentary evidence pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (1) “may be appropriately granted where the documentary evidence utterly refutes the plaintiff’s factual allegation, conclusively establishing a defense as a matter of law” (Goshen v Mutual Life Ins. Co. of N.Y., 98 NY2d 314, 326 [2002]; Leon v Martinez, 84 NY2d 83, 88 [1994]). Not every piece of evidence in the form of a document is properly deemed “documentary evidence.” The appellate courts have noted this distinction, finding that legislative history and supporting cases make it clear that “judicial records, as well as documents reflecting out-of-court transactions such as mortgages, deeds, contracts, and any other papers, the contents of which are ‘essentially undeniable,’ would qualify as ‘documentary evidence’ in the proper case” (Fontanetta

v Doe, 73 AD3d 78, 86 [2d Dept 2010]; Amsterdam Hosp. Grp., LLC v Marshall-Alan Assocs., Inc., 120 AD3d 431, 432 [1st Dept 2014]).

In support of their motion defendants submit the certificate of incorporation for both Foundling and Catholic Charities; the Foundling amendments; an affidavit from Foundling's Special Counsel, Itohan Omoregie, an affidavit from the Archdiocese's Associate General Counsel, Roderick Cassidy, and an affidavit from the Associate Executive Director of Catholic Charities, Talia Lockspeiser. Defendants argue that the evidence shows that they did not create, oversee, supervise, manage, control, direct, or operate the Foundling and its placements, nor Foundling's staff, employees, foster parents, or children; and the movants did not have any relationship with the alleged abusers.

The fact that the co-defendants are separately formed entities does not negate the possibility that, as alleged in the complaint, the Archdiocese had any control over the Foundling or Catholic Charities, and/or its employees or agents (see generally Engelman v Rofe, 194 AD3d 26, 33-34 [1st Dept 2021] [the court is required to accept these allegations in the complaint as true]).

The affidavits submitted do not constitute "documentary evidence" within the meaning of CPLR 3211 (a) (1) (see J.D. v Archdiocese of New York, — AD3d —, 2023 NY Slip Op 01588 [1st Dept Mar. 23, 2023]; Correa v Orient-Express Hotels, Inc., 84 AD3d 651 [1st Dept 2011] citing, inter alia, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP v Fashion Boutique of Short Hills, Inc., 10 AD3d 267, 271 [1st Dept 2004]; Fontanetta v Doe, 73 AD3d 78, 86 [2d Dept 2010] ["it is clear that affidavits and deposition testimony are not 'documentary evidence' within the intendment of a CPLR 3211(a)(1) motion to dismiss"]).

Further, although "a trial court may use affidavits in its consideration of a pleading motion to dismiss," where, as here, the Court declines to convert the motion into one for summary

judgment, such affidavits “are not to be examined for the purpose of determining whether there is evidentiary support for the pleading” (Rovello v Orofino Realty Co., Inc., 40 NY2d 633, 635 [1976]). Consequently, affidavits submitted from a defendant “will almost never warrant dismissal under CPLR 3211” (Lawrence v Miller, 11 NY3d 588, 595 [2008]) “unless [they] establish conclusively that plaintiff has no cause of action” (Rovello, 40 NY2d at 636).

Here it cannot be said that defendants met their burden establishing that plaintiff has no claim against them as a matter of law because the affidavits are not conclusive particularly as to defendants’ relationship with co-defendants and/or the alleged abusers (see J.D., 2023 NY Slip Op 01588; Engelman, 194 AD3d at 33-34). It is important to note that an affidavit is not necessarily subject to cross examination and the issue of whether an agency or employment relationship exists sufficient to hold defendants liable for co-defendants’ acts and/or any defendant’s negligence in failing to exercise reasonable care in hiring, supervising, or retaining the alleged abusers, may be a fact-intensive analysis as to the extent of defendants’ power to order and control the agent’s or employee’s performance of work (see generally Castro-Quesada v Tuapanta, 148 AD3d 978, 979 [2d Dept 2017], quoting Barak v Chen, 87 AD3d 955, 957 [2d Dept 2011]; Griffin v Sirva, Inc., 29 NY3d 174, 185-86 [2017] [noting that factors as to whether one is an employer may include ““(1) the selection and engagement of the servant; (2) the payment of salary or wages; (3) the power of dismissal; and (4) the power of control of the servant’s conduct””] quoting State Div. of Human Rights v GTE Corp., 109 AD2d 1082, 1083 [4th Dept 1985]).

Defendants’ alternate request for relief pursuant to CPLR 3212 is denied as well. First, CPLR 3212 (a) explicitly requires that issue be joined and defendants have not yet filed an answer (see Alro Builders and Contractors, Inc. v Chicken Koop, Inc., 78 AD2d 512, 512 [1st Dept 1980]). Second, it is clear that discovery remains outstanding related to the issue mentioned above about

the exact nature and scope of the relationship between defendants, co-defendants, and the tortfeasor(s), among others. Accordingly, summary judgment is premature (see Rutherford v Brooklyn Navy Yard Dev. Corp., 174 AD3d 932, 933 [2d Dept 2019]; Rodriguez Pastor v DeGaetano, 128 AD3d 218, 227-28 [1st Dept 2015]).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is denied; and it is further

ORDERED that the movants shall file and serve an answer to the complaint within twenty (20) days from service of a copy of this order with notice of entry; and it is further

ORDERED that the parties shall proceed with discovery pursuant to CMO No. 2, Section IX (B) (1) and submit a follow up compliance conference order on or before 9-1-2023 (see NYSCEF Doc No 59).

This constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

7/28/2023

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.