

**Waldon v A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co.**

2023 NY Slip Op 33487(U)

October 6, 2023

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: Index No. 190087/2019

Judge: Adam Silvera

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(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**

<p><b>PRESENT: <u>HON. ADAM SILVERA</u></b></p> <p align="right"><i>Justice</i></p> <p align="right">-----X</p> <p>DACKASHAY WALDON AS EXECUTOR FOR THE ESTATE OF ROBERT O WALDON,</p> <p align="center">Plaintiff,</p>	<p><b>PART</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>13</b></span></p> <p><b>INDEX NO.</b> <u>190087/2019</u></p> <p><b>MOTION DATE</b> <u>07/25/2023</u></p> <p><b>MOTION SEQ. NO.</b> <u>004</u></p>
---	---

- v -

A.O. SMITH WATER PRODUCTS CO., AIR & LIQUID SYSTEMS CORPORATION, AS SUCCESSOR-BY-MERGER TO BUFFALO PUMPS, INC, AMCHEM PRODUCTS, INC., N/K/A RHONE POULENC AG COMPANY, N/K/A BAYER CROPSCIENCE INC, ATWOOD & MORRILL COMPANY, AURORA PUMP COMPANY, BLACKMER, BORGWARNER MORSE TEC LLC, BURNHAM, LLC, INDIVIDUALLY, AND AS SUCCESSOR TO BURNHAM CORPORATION, BW/IP, INC. AND ITS WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARIES, CARRIER CORPORATION, CBS CORPORATION, F/K/A VIACOM INC., SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO CBS CORPORATION, F/K/A WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION, CERTAINTeed CORPORATION, CLEAVER BROOKS COMPANY, INC, CRANE CO, CROSBY VALVE LLC, EATON CORPORATION, AS SUCCESSOR -IN-INTEREST TO CUTLER-HAMMER, INC., ELECTROLUX HOME PRODUCTS, INC. INDIVIDUALLY, AND AS SUCCESSOR TO TAPPAN AND COPEES-VULCAN, FLOWSERVE US, INC. SOLELY AS SUCCESSOR TO ROCKWELL MANUFACTURING COMPANY, EDWARD VALVE, INC., NORDSTROM VALVES, INC., EDWARD VOGT VALVE COMPANY, AND VOGT VALVE COMPANY, FMC CORPORATION, ON BEHALF OF ITS FORMER CHICAGO PUMP & NORTHERN PUMP BUSINESSES, FOSTER WHEELER, L.L.C., GARDNER DENVER, INC, GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, GOULDS PUMPS LLC, GRINNELL LLC, HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC., F/K/A ALLIED SIGNAL, INC. / BENDIX, IMO INDUSTRIES, INC, ITT INDUSTRIES, INC. INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR-IN-INTEREST TO HOFFMAN SPECIALTY, ITT LLC., INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR TO BELL & GOSSETT AND AS SUCCESSOR TO KENNEDY VALVE MANUFACTURING CO., INC, NELES-JAMESBURY INC, PEERLESS INDUSTRIES, INC, PFIZER, INC. (PFIZER), ROPER PUMP COMPANY, SPIRAX SARCO, INC. INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR TO SARCO COMPANY, THE NASH ENGINEERING COMPANY, U.S. RUBBER COMPANY

**DECISION + ORDER ON  
MOTION**

(UNIROYAL), UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION, VELAN VALVE CORPORATION, VIKING PUMP, INC., WARREN PUMPS, LLC, WEIL-MCLAIN, A DIVISION OF THE MARLEY-WYLAIN COMPANY, A WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF THE MARLEY COMPANY, LLC, GOODYEAR CANADA, INC., THE GOODYEAR TIRE AND RUBBER COMPANY, TYCO INTERNATIONAL (US) INC., PARAMOUNT GLOBAL, F/K/A VIACOMCBS INC., F/K/A CBS CORPORATION, A DELAWARE CORPORATION, F/K/A VIACOM INC., SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO CBS CORPORATION, A PENNSYLVANIA CORPORATION, F/K/A WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION, REDCO CORP. F/K/A CRANE CO., THE MARLEY-WYLAIN COMPANY,

Defendant.

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274

were read on this motion to/for

JUDGMENT - SUMMARY

Upon the foregoing documents, it is ordered that the instant motion for summary judgment seeking dismissal of this action, pursuant to CPLR §3212, is decided in accordance with the decision below.

Here, defendant The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company (“Goodyear”) files a motion for summary judgment seeking to dismiss this action on the basis that its products could not have caused plaintiff-decedent Robert Waldon’s (“Mr. Waldon”) lung cancer. *See* Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company’s Motion for Summary Judgment, p. 4. Defendant Goodyear proffers the expert reports of industrial hygienist John Spencer, CIH, CSP and medical doctor Robert Sussman, MD, FCCP to establish that any asbestos exposure from Goodyear manufactured products was not the cause of Mr. Waldon’s lung cancer. *See* Affirmation in Support of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company’s Motion for Summary Judgment, dated December 1, 2022, Exhs. D & E. Plaintiffs oppose, noting Mr. Waldon’s specific testimony identifying Goodyear gaskets, defendant Goodyear’s manufacturing

history regarding asbestos-containing sheet gasket material, and submitting the expert reports of industrial hygienist Kenneth Garza, CIH, MS and medical doctor Mark E. Ginsburg, MD. *See Affirmation in Opposition to The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company's Motion for Summary Judgment*, p. 9; 20-23.

The Court notes that summary judgment is a drastic remedy and should only be granted if the moving party has sufficiently established that it is warranted as a matter of law. *See Alvarez v Prospect Hosp.*, 68 NY2d 320, 324 (1986). "The proponent of a summary judgment motion must make a prima facie showing of entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, tendering sufficient evidence to eliminate any material issues of fact from the case". *Winegrad v New York University Medical Center*, 64 NY2d 851, 853 (1985). Despite the sufficiency of the opposing papers, the failure to make such a showing requires denial of the motion. *See id.* at 853. Additionally, summary judgment motions should be denied if the opposing party presents admissible evidence establishing that there is a genuine issue of fact remaining. *See Zuckerman v City of New York*, 49 NY2d 557, 560 (1980). "In determining whether summary judgment is appropriate, the motion court should draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party and should not pass on issues of credibility." *Garcia v J.C. Duggan, Inc.*, 180 AD2d 579, 580 (1<sup>st</sup> Dep't 1992), citing *Dauman Displays, Inc. v Masturzo*, 168 AD2d 204 (1<sup>st</sup> Dep't 1990). The court's role is "issue-finding, rather than issue-determination". *Sillman v Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.*, 3 NY2d 395, 404 (1957) (internal quotations omitted). As such, summary judgment is rarely granted in negligence actions unless there is no conflict at all in the evidence. *See Ugarriza v Schmieder*, 46 NY2d 471, 475-476 (1979). Furthermore, the Appellate Division, First Department has held that on a motion for summary judgment, it is moving defendant's

burden “to unequivocally establish that its product could not have contributed to the causation of plaintiff’s injury”. *Reid v Georgia-Pacific Corp.*, 212 AD2d 462, 463 (1<sup>st</sup> Dep’t 1995).

The appropriate standard for summary judgment for moving defendant can be found in *Dyer v Amchem Products Inc.*, 207 AD3d 408, 409 (1st Dep’t 2022). In *Dyer*, defendants were granted summary judgment not by “simply argu[ing] that plaintiff could not affirmatively prove causation” but by “affirmatively prov[ing], as a matter of law, that there was no causation.” *Id.* Here, defendant Goodyear fails to meet their burden on summary judgment as set forth in *Dyer*. Defendants in *Dyer* proffered a simulation study that measured the amount of asbestos released from cutting the exact tiles manufactured *by them* and at issue in the case. *See id.* at 411.

Here, defendant Goodyear’s reliance on the affidavit of John Spencer is insufficient to dispel any questions of fact regarding Mr. Waldon’s exposure to asbestos from Goodyear gasket material. Plaintiffs highlight a significant conflicting opinion from their expert, Dr. Ginsburg, regarding the amount of asbestos releasable from “non-friable products,” which is contrary to Goodyear’s primary defense that its non-friable gasket sheets significantly reduced the potential release of asbestos and could not have caused Mr. Waldon’s cancer. *See Affirmation in Opposition, supra*, p. 14-15. Such conflict is sufficient to establish genuine questions of fact. Further, defendant Goodyear’s second expert opinion from Dr. Sussman does not provide an estimate of Mr. Waldon’s exposure to Goodyear products as required by *Dyer*. *See supra* at p. 16-17.

Thus, defendant Goodyear has failed to meet its burden to establish that its products could not have been the cause for plaintiff’s illness. *See Reid v Georgia-Pacific Corp., supra*.

Furthermore, as a reasonable juror could decide that asbestos exposure from Goodyear products was a cause of Mr. Waldon's lung cancer, sufficient issues of fact exist to preclude summary judgment.


Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that defendant Goodyear's motion for summary judgment is denied in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that within 30 days of entry defendants shall serve plaintiffs with a copy of this Decision/Order with notice of entry.

This constitutes the Decision/Order of the Court.

10/06/2023  
DATE

  
ADAM SILVERA, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:

CASE DISPOSED

NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

GRANTED

DENIED

GRANTED IN PART

OTHER

APPLICATION:

SETTLE ORDER

SUBMIT ORDER

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:

INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

REFERENCE