

Gold v Avon Prods., Inc.

2023 NY Slip Op 33489(U)

October 5, 2023

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: Index No. 190165/2019

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**

PRESENT: HON. ADAM SILVERA PART 13

Justice

-----X

MERRITT ELLIS GOLD AND PAULA THERESE NEARY,
AS CO-EXECUTORS OF THE ESTATE OF VICTORIA
KAYE, DECEASED,

Plaintiff,

- v -

AVON PRODUCTS, INC., BLOOMINGDALES,
INC., BRENNTAG NORTH AMERICA, INC., INDIVIDUALLY
AND AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO MINERAL
PIGMENT SOLUTIONS, INC., AS SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST TO WHITTAKER, CLARK & DANIELS,
INC., BRENNTAG SPECIALTIES, INC. F/K/A MINERAL
PIGMENT SOLUTIONS, INC. AND AS SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST TO WHITTAKER, CLARK & DANIELS,
INC., CHANEL CO., CHANEL, INC., COTY INC., COTY
INTERNATIONAL INC., GLAXOSMITHKLINE,
LLC, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR-IN-INTEREST
TO YARDLEY OF LONDON, INC., YARDLEY OF LONDON,
LTD., AND YARDLEY OF LONDON (U.S.), LLC, MACYS,
INC., MINERAL AND PIGMENT SOLUTIONS, INC., F/K/A
WHITTAKER, CLARK & DANIELS, INC., PFIZER
INC., INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST
TO COTY INC. AND COTY INTERNATIONAL
INC., REVLON, INC., THE PROCTOR & GAMBLE
COMPANY, AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO THE
SHULTON COMPANY AND AS SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST TO YARDLEY OF LONDON, INC., YARDLEY OF
LONDON, LTD., AND YARDLEY OF LONDON (U.S.),
LLC, WHITTAKER, CLARK & DANIELS, INC.

Defendant.

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 85, 86, 87, 88, 89,
90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175,
176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196,
197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 404, 405,
406, 407, 408, 409

were read on this motion to/for

PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

**DECISION + ORDER ON
MOTION**

Upon the foregoing documents, it is ordered that defendant Chanel, Inc.'s ("Chanel") instant motion for partial summary judgment on the issue of punitive damages is denied in accordance with the decision below.

Here, defendant Chanel moves to dismiss plaintiff's punitive damages claim on the basis that Chanel did not exhibit the "level of malice and near criminal reckless disregard" necessary to justify such damages. *See* Memorandum of Law in Support of Chanel, Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the Issue of Punitive Damages, p. 2. Plaintiff opposes, noting that Chanel was aware of the presence of asbestos in its talc and the negative impacts of asbestos as early as the 1970s and continued to use asbestos-containing talc in its products for over twenty years after.

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 (1st Dep't 1992), citing *Dauman Displays, Inc. v Masturzo*, 168 AD2d 204 (1st 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 (1st Dep't 1995).

Here, defendant Chanel argues that aside from the lawsuits from plaintiff's counsel, it was never put on notice that the talc used in their products contained asbestos. This is insufficient to meet its burden at summary judgment. Defendant has not offered any evidence that dispels with certainty questions of fact regarding their level of recklessness or wanton disregard regarding asbestos in its talc. Plaintiffs have submitted numerous documents indicating that Chanel was aware of the contamination in its talc in the 1970s but continued to use the same talc in its products for at least two decades without warning the public. The Court notes that where a plaintiff provides evidentiary facts tending to show that defendant's warnings were in any way deficient, the adequacy of such warnings are a factual question that should be resolved by a jury. *See Eiser v Feldman*, 123 AD2d 583, 584 (1986). The New York Court of Appeals has also held that "[a] products liability action founded on a failure to warn involves conduct of the defendant having attributes of negligence which the jury may find sufficiently wanton or reckless to sustain an award of punitive damages." *Home Ins. Co. v American Home Products Corp.*, 75 NY2d 196, 204 (1990) (internal citations omitted).


As a reasonable juror could find that Chanel was on notice of its contaminated talc and that its subsequent conduct and usage of such talc rises to the level required for punitive damages, issues of fact exist to preclude summary judgment on punitive damages.

Accordingly, it is

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

ORDERED that within 30 days of entry plaintiff shall serve all parties with a copy of this Decision/Order with notice of entry.

This constitutes the Decision/Order of the Court.



10/05/2023
DATE

ADAM SILVERA, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:	<input type="checkbox"/>	CASE DISPOSED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DENIED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	<input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER
APPLICATION:	<input type="checkbox"/>	GRANTED	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	GRANTED IN PART	<input type="checkbox"/>	
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	<input type="checkbox"/>	SETTLE ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SUBMIT ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/>	REFERENCE
	<input type="checkbox"/>	INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	