

Carbajal v 399 Sunrise Highway Corp.
2023 NY Slip Op 35272(U)
August 1, 2023
Supreme Court, Nassau County
Docket Number: Index No. 601176/2020
Judge: Erica L. Prager
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
COUNTY OF NASSAU**

PRESENT: ERICA L. PRAGER, J.S.C.

ALEXANDER CARBAJAL,

Plaintiff,

IAS/TRIAL PART 18

Motion Seq.: 2, 3, 4, 5

Submission Date: 4/25/23

-against-

Index No.: 601176/20

**399 SUNRISE HIGHWAY CORP., FADI ALMAHMOUD,
a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD, TILE WORLD IMPORT CORP.,
d/b/a TILE EXPO, TILE EXPO INC. and EXPO KITCHEN
& BATH, INC.,**

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Motion Sequence 2

Notice of Motion, Affirmation, Memorandum of Law
& Exhibits

74-91

Affirmation in Opposition, Memorandum of Law
& Exhibits.....

127-139; 115-125

Affirmation in Reply.....

140, 144

Motion Sequence 3

Notice of Motion, Affirmation, Memorandum of Law,
Statement of Material Facts & Exhibits

93-107

Affirmation in Opposition, Response to Statement of
Material Facts & Exhibit.....

109-111

Affirmation in Reply.....

146

Motion Sequence 4

Notice of Cross-Motion, Affirmation, Memorandum of Law,
& Exhibits

126-139

Affirmation in Opposition.....

140

Affirmation in Reply.....

147

Motion Sequence 5

Notice of Cross-Motion, Affirmation, Memorandum of Law,
& Exhibits

114-125

Affirmation in Opposition.....

140, 142

Affirmation, Memorandum of Law in Reply.....

148, 153

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

Preamble:

Upon the foregoing papers, Plaintiff ALEXANDER CARBAJAL'S motion seeking an order pursuant to Civil Practice Law and Rules ("CPLR") 3212, granting partial summary judgment in his favor and imposing liability against Defendants pursuant to Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6); and, Defendant FADI ALMAHMOUD a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD'S motion seeking an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting summary judgment in his favor and dismissing Plaintiff's complaint and all cross-claims against him; and, Defendants FADI ALMAHMOUD a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD and 399 SUNRISE HIGHWAY CORP.'S cross-motion seeking an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting summary judgment in their favor and dismissing Plaintiff's complaint and all cross-claims against them; and, Defendants TILE WORLD IMPORT CORP. d/b/a TILE EXPO, TILE EXPO INC. and EXPO KITCHEN & BATH, INC.'S cross-motion seeking an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting summary judgment in their favor and dismissing Plaintiff's complaint, are consolidated for disposition and determined as set forth hereinafter.

Factual Background:

This is an action to recover damages for severe and permanent injuries allegedly sustained by Plaintiff when a falling object struck him in the face while he was working on a construction project at commercial real property.

On June 20, 2018, Plaintiff was employed as a welder by non-party PMF Steel ("PMF"), a subcontractor engaged in the installation of steel columns at a construction project on commercial real property located at 389-403 Sunrise Highway, Freeport, New York ("the Premises"). Plaintiff alleges the following: On the date of the accident, Plaintiff and two (2) other PMF employees, Angel Morocho ("Morocho") and Hector Ramirez ("Ramirez"), were on site. Prior to the accident, the steel column was being stored horizontally on the ground. While in that position, Ramirez tied a leather strap to a clip located at the top of the steel column, which was then secured to the blade of a forklift being operated by Morocho. Once the steel column was secured to the blade of the forklift, Morocho raised the blades of the forklift approximately fifteen (15) feet, lifting the steel column vertically, and drove towards the location where the steel column would be installed. At the installation location, Plaintiff squatted down and began connecting the bolts, nuts, and washers. While in that squatting position, with the forklift still in motion and its blades still in a raised position, a blade of the forklift became unattached and fell from a height of approximately twelve (12) feet, striking Plaintiff in the face.

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

At the time of the accident, the owner of the Premises was Defendant 399 SUNRISE HIGHWAY CORP. ("399 Sunrise"); the "general contractor" was listed on the permit as Defendant TILE WORLD IMPORT CORP. d/b/a TILE EXPO ("Tile Expo"); and the president of 399 Sunrise and Tile Expo was Defendant FADI ALMAHMOUD a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD ("Almahmoud").

Procedural Background:

On January 24, 2020, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a summons and complaint, which was amended on March 24, 2020. By his complaint and bills of particular, Plaintiff asserts violations of Labor Law §§ 200, 240(1), and 241(6), Industrial Code Rule 23 *et seq.*, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor ("OSHA") Article 1926 *et seq.*, as well as common law negligence. In pertinent part, the pleadings allege that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with the devices to give him proper protection; that Defendants provided Plaintiff with a defective forklift; and, that Defendants were negligent in failing to provide adequate supervision and in "permitting, allowing and causing said premises and fork-lift to be and remain in a defective, dilapidated, and/or dangerous condition." Plaintiff further asserts that as a result of Defendants' alleged statutory violations and negligence, he has suffered severe and permanent injuries including, without limitation, several fractures that required surgery and hospitalization.

On June 25, 2020, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud joined issue with their answer containing denials, affirmative defenses, and a cross-claim against THREE 99 SUNRISE HIGHWAY CORP. ("Three 99 Sunrise")¹ Tile Expo and Defendants TILE EXPO, INC. and EXPO KITCHEN & BATH INC. (collectively, "Tile") for common law indemnity and contribution. On June 29, 2020, Tile Expo and Tile joined issue with their answer containing denials, affirmative defenses, and a cross-claim against Three 99 Sunrise and 399 Sunrise for common law indemnity and contribution.

Depositions of Plaintiff were held on August 30, 2021 and November 23, 2021; and, a deposition of Almahmoud was held on February 2, 2022. By the Certification Order entered on July 5, 2022, this Court (Prager, J.) certified this case as ready for trial.

¹

By Order entered on May 20, 2021, this Court (Sullivan, J.) dismissed the complaint as against Three 99 Sunrise.

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

Motion Seq. Nos. 2-5:

By Notice of Motion filed on October 6, 2022 (“Motion Seq. No. 2”),² Plaintiff moves for an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting partial summary judgment in his favor and imposing liability against Defendants pursuant to Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6). By Notice of Motion filed on October 4, 2022 (“Motion Seq. No. 3”), Almahmoud moves for an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting summary judgment in his favor and dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint and all cross-claims against him. By Notice of Cross-Motion filed on February 14, 2023 (“Motion Seq. No. 4”), 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud cross-move for an order pursuant to CPLR 3212, granting summary judgment in their favor and dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint and all cross-claims asserted against them. By Notice of Cross-Motion filed on February 15, 2023 (“Motion Seq. No. 5”), Tile Expo and Tile cross-move for an order granting summary judgment in their favor and dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint. The parties’ respective arguments and relevant case law is addressed, in turn, hereinafter.

Analysis:

Motion Seq. Nos. 2, 4 and 5

Labor Law § 240(1)

By Motion Seq. No. 2, Plaintiff moves, in pertinent part, for an order granting partial summary judgment and imposing liability against Defendants pursuant to Labor Law § 240(1). Plaintiff argues that the blade dislodging and falling from the forklift, which was being used to lift and install the steel column, is prima facie evidence of Defendants’ failure to provide Plaintiff with adequate protection pursuant to Labor Law § 240. Plaintiff further argues that the dislodged blade being the proximate cause of Plaintiff’s injuries is self-evident. In support of his motion, Plaintiff submits the Expert Affidavit of licensed professional engineer, Adam C. Cassel, P.E., DFE (“Cassel”), who, in addition to finding that Defendants violated Labor Law § 240(1), submits that the steel column itself “imparted an off-center load onto the forks which made the forks further susceptible to becoming disconnected or detaching.” Cassel further opines that “the forklift truck was not an adequate or safe piece of equipment to use for the hoisting and erection of steel columns at the construction site and therefore can be cited as a proximate cause for Plaintiff’s accident.”

² Plaintiff’s Notice of Motion was initially filed on October 3, 2022 and was corrected and re-filed on October 6, 2022.

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY

Index No.: 601176/20

By Motion Seq. No. 4, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud oppose Plaintiff's requested relief and seek, *inter alia*, dismissal of Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 240(1). By Motion Seq. No. 5, Tile Expo and Tile seek the same relief. Defendants argue that Labor Law § 240(1) is inapplicable because Plaintiff was not injured by the object being hoisted (i.e., the steel column). Tile Expo and Tile further argue that Labor Law § 240(1) is inapplicable because the particular blade that fell had not been used to secure or suspend the steel column. Defendants' arguments are unavailing.

In pertinent part, Labor Law § 240(1) provides that

"All contractors and owners and their agents . . . in the erection, demolition, repairing, altering, painting, cleaning or pointing of a building or structure shall furnish or erect, or cause to be furnished or erected for the performance of such labor, scaffolding, hoists, stays, ladders, slings, hangers, blocks, pulleys, braces, irons, ropes, and other devices which shall be so constructed, placed and operated as to give proper protection to a person so employed"

To establish liability, the moving party must demonstrate a violation of the statute and that the violation was the proximate cause of the injury sustained (*Blake v Neighborhood Housing Servs. of New York City, Inc.*, 1 NY3d 280 [2003]).

Labor Law § 240(1) is intended "to be construed as liberally as possible" to further its legislative intent, which is to protect against special hazards that "consist of gravity-related accidents, such as 'falling from a height or being struck by a falling object that was improperly hoisted or inadequately secured'" (*Jiron v China Buddhist Assn.*, 266 AD2d 347 [2d Dept 1999], quoting *Ross v Curtis-Palmer Hydro-Elec. Co.*, 81 NY2d 494 [1993]). The Second Department has extended this protection to hazards created by the hoist itself, finding that:

"The statutory requirement that workers be provided with proper protection extends not only to the hazards of building materials falling from the hoist as they are being conveyed to the top of the structure, but also to the hazard of a defective hoist, or portion of the hoist, falling from an elevated level to the ground" (*Jiron*, 266 AD2d at 349; *see also Castillo v 62-65 30th Ave. Realty, LLC*, 47 AD3d 865 [2d Dept 2008]; *Fitzsimmons v City of New York*, 37 AD3d 655 [2d Dept 2007]).

Notably, in *Jiron*, the plaintiff was not struck by an object being hoisted, but by a component of the hoist (i.e., its engine) when it became disengaged and fell from an elevated level (266 AD2d at 348).

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

In the instant matter, it is undisputed that the forklift was being utilized to secure, transport, erect, and install steel columns. In any event, by its own definition, a forklift is “a self-propelled machine for hoisting and transporting heavy objects by means of steel fingers inserted under the load.” (Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, forklift [<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/forklift>]). Thus, the forklift herein “meets the statutory definition of a hoist” – one of the devices specifically enumerated in Labor Law § 240(1) (*Fitzsimmons*, 37 AD3d at 656). Consequently, as established in *Jiron*, there was a statutory obligation imposed upon the owner and contractor of the Premises to provide Plaintiff proper protection not only from the hazard of the steel column falling, but from a defective component of the forklift falling. The cases proffered by Defendants to refute this point are either factually distinguishable or not controlling herein.

However, while it is undisputed that 399 Sunrise was the owner of the Premises and while the record indicates that Tile Expo was the general contractor of the construction project, the record is unclear as to Tile’s involvement herein. Thus, Plaintiff has failed to establish its prima facie entitlement to partial summary judgment on the issue of liability pursuant to Labor Law § 240(1) as against all Defendants.

Labor Law § 241(6)

By Motion Seq. No. 2, Plaintiff moves in pertinent part, for an order granting partial summary judgment and imposing liability against Defendants pursuant to Labor Law § 241(6), asserting violations of the Industrial Code and OSHA. By Motion Seq. No. 4, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud oppose Plaintiff’s requested relief and seek, *inter alia*, dismissal of Plaintiff’s claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 241(6). By Motion Seq. No. 5, Tile Expo and Tile seek the same relief.

In pertinent part, Labor Law § 241(6) provides that:

“All contractors and owners and their agents . . . when constructing or demolishing buildings or doing any excavating in connection therewith, shall comply with the following requirements

. . .
All areas in which construction, excavation or demolition work is being performed shall be so constructed, shored, equipped, guarded, arranged, operated and conducted as to provide reasonable and adequate protection and safety to the persons employed therein or lawfully frequenting such places.”

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

"To establish liability under Labor Law § 241(6), [plaintiff] must demonstrate that his injuries were proximately caused by a violation of an Industrial Code provision that is applicable under the circumstances of the case" (*Aragona v State*, 147 AD3d 808 [2d Dept 2017]). To the extent the moving party seeks to invoke a non-delegable duty, violations of specific provisions must be asserted (*Ross*, 81 NY2d 494).

Here, Plaintiff asserts violations of 12 NYCRR §§ 23-2.3(a)(1), 23-2.3(c), 23-9.8(e), 23-9.8(j), and 23-9.2(a) and Defendants challenge each, in turn.

In pertinent part, 12 NYCRR § 23-2.3(a)(1) provides that: "During the final placing of structural steel members, loads shall not be released from hoisting ropes until such members are securely fastened in place. Structural steel members shall not be forced into place by hoisting machines while any person is so located that he may be injured thereby." Moreover, 12 NYCRR § 23-2.3(c) provides that: "While steel panels or structural steel members are being hoisted, tag lines shall be provided and used to prevent uncontrolled movement of such panels or members." Plaintiff argues that these provisions were violated because the forklift was in use while Plaintiff was working in its vicinity. In opposition, Defendants argue that these provisions are inapplicable because they are intended to prevent injury from the steel column itself and, that even if they were applicable, no violation occurred because the steel column was not being "forced" into position. Given that 12 NYCRR § 23-2.3 involves "the final placing of structural steel members," which was the task being undertaken by Plaintiff at the time of the accident such provision is applicable herein. However, insofar as Defendants challenge whether the steel column was being "forced" into position, they have raised a triable issue of fact as to whether this provision was violated. Therefore, both Plaintiff's requested relief and Defendants' requested relief is denied.

In pertinent part, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.8(e) provides that: "No lift or fork truck shall be used on any surface that is so uneven as to make upsetting likely." Plaintiff argues that this provision was violated because Plaintiff testified that the area in which the forklift was operating was "bumpy." In opposition, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud argue that this provision is inapplicable because "the forklift was defective, not 'upset;'" and, Tile Expo and Tile argue that, even if violated, the allegation that such violation was the proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries is purely speculative. Given the allegation that the forklift was operated on uneven ground, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.8(e) is applicable herein. However, Defendants raised a triable issue of fact as to whether this provision was violated and, if so, whether the violation was the proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries. Therefore, both Plaintiff's requested relief and Defendants' requested relief is denied.

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

In pertinent part, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.8(j) provides that: “No lift or fork truck shall be in motion when the loaded forks are elevated higher than necessary to clear floor obstructions except as required for positioning to deposit the load.” Plaintiff argues that this provision was violated because Plaintiff testified that the forklift, with raised blades, was in motion when the accident occurred. In opposition, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud argue that this provision is inapplicable because “the forklift was defective, not ‘upset;’” and, Tile Expo and Tile argue that the record does not indicate that the blades were elevated “higher than necessary.” Given the allegation that the forklift was in motion with raised blades, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.8(j) is applicable herein. However, Defendants raised a triable issue of fact as to whether this provision was violated. Therefore, both Plaintiff’s requested relief and Defendants’ requested relief is denied.

In pertinent part, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.2(a) provides that:
“All power-operated equipment shall be maintained in good repair and in proper operating condition at all times. Sufficient inspections of adequate frequency shall be made of such equipment to insure such maintenance. Upon discovery, any structural defect or unsafe condition in such equipment shall be corrected by necessary repairs or replacement. The servicing and repair of such equipment shall be performed by or under the supervision of designated persons. Any servicing or repairing of such equipment shall be performed only while such equipment is at rest.”

Plaintiff argues that this provision was violated by virtue of the fact that the blade became detached. In opposition, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud argue that only the third sentence of 12 NYCRR § 23-9.2(a) has been found to be sufficiently specific to permit recovery pursuant to Labor Law § 241(6) (*Misicki v Caradonna*, 12 NY3d 511 [2009]). To that end, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud argue that liability may only be imposed if they received actual notice of the defect. Tile Expo and Tile argue that Almahmoud, owner of Tile Expo and Tile, had no knowledge of the forklift’s condition. Given the allegation that the forklift was defective, 12 NYCRR § 23-9.2(a) is applicable herein. However, Defendants raised a triable issue of fact as to whether this provision was violated. Therefore, both Plaintiff’s requested relief and Defendants’ requested relief is denied.

Insofar as Plaintiff alleges violations of OSHA, the Second Department has found that “violations of OSHA standards do not provide a basis for liability under Labor Law § 241 (6)” (*Greenwood v Shearson, Lehman & Hutton*, 238 AD2d 311 [2d Dept 1997]).

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

Labor Law § 200 and Common Law Negligence

By Motion Seq. No. 4, 399 Sunrise and Almahmoud cross-move, in pertinent part, for an order granting summary judgment and dismissing Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 200; or, alternatively, under a theory of common law negligence, arguing that they "did not create any condition or have actual or constructive notice of any condition which caused plaintiff's injuries" and that they "did not have any role at the construction site other than being the owner and observing the construction from a distance." By Motion Seq. No. 5, Tile Expo and Tile seek the same relief, arguing that the record clearly indicates that Plaintiff "only received direction and supervision of his work from [Morochó]."

Plaintiff opposes Defendants' requested relief, arguing that Defendants' lack of supervision of the work itself does not absolve them of liability for a dangerous condition on the Premises, such as the allegedly uneven ground over which the forklift drove.

"Labor Law § 200 (1) is a codification of the common-law duty of an owner or general contractor to provide workers with a safe place to work" (*Ortega v Puccia*, 57 AD3d 54 [2d Dept 2008]). "Cases involving Labor Law § 200 fall into two broad categories: namely, those where workers are injured as a result of dangerous or defective premises conditions at a worksite, and those involving the manner in which the work is performed" (*Id.* at 61). Where both categories are alleged, the party seeking dismissal "is obligated to address the proof applicable to both liability standards" (*Marquez v L&M Dev. Partners, Inc.*, 141 AD3d 694 [2d Dept 2016]). Regarding a "dangerous or defective premises condition," liability may be imposed "if the owner either created the dangerous condition that caused the accident or had actual or constructive notice of the dangerous condition that caused the accident" (*Ortega*, 57 AD3d at 61). However, regarding "the manner in which the work is performed," liability may only be imposed if "the party to be charged had the authority to supervise or control the performance of the work" (*Id.*). To this end, "mere general supervisory authority at a work site for the purpose of overseeing the progress of the work and inspecting the work product is insufficient to impose liability under Labor Law § 200" (*Id.* at 62). "A defendant has the authority to supervise or control the work for purposes of Labor Law § 200 when that defendant bears the responsibility for the manner in which the work is performed" (*Id.*).

Here, insofar as Plaintiff alleges that the "bumpy ground surface" over which the forklift drove created "a dangerous or defective premises condition," Plaintiff, relying on Almahmoud's testimony that he would sometimes pass by the Premises, has raised a triable issue of fact as to whether Defendants had constructive notice sufficient to impose liability. However, insofar as

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

Plaintiff alleges an issue with the manner of work, Defendants, relying on Plaintiff's testimony that his work was supervised and controlled solely by Morocho, established their prima facie entitlement to dismissal by demonstrating that they did not have the authority to supervise or control Plaintiff's work for purposes of Labor Law § 200 (*see, e.g., Ortega*, 57 AD3d at 62; *Dupkanicova v Vasiloff*, 35 AD3d 650 [2d Dept 2006]). In opposition, Plaintiff fails to raise a triable issue of fact. Therefore, Defendants are entitled to dismissal of Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 200; or, alternatively, under a theory of common law negligence, to the extent the claim involves "the manner in which the work is performed."

Motion Seq. No. 3

By Motion Seq. No. 3, Almahmoud moves for an order granting summary judgment in his favor and dismissing the complaint and all cross-claims as asserted against him, individually. Almahmoud argues that he cannot be held personally liable herein because his actions were undertaken solely in his capacity as the principal of 399 Sunrise and Tile Expo. Almahmoud argues that Plaintiff has failed to plead a cause of action seeking to pierce the corporate veil and that, even if he had, he could not support such a claim. Plaintiff opposes Almahmoud's application, arguing that Almahmoud fails to produce any evidence to demonstrate that he is not personally liable and, thereby, fails to satisfy his initial burden. Plaintiff further argues that copies of the permit applications for the construction project list Almahmoud in his individual capacity.

Generally, "a corporation exists independently of its owners, who are not personally liable for its obligations" (*E. Hampton Union Free Sch. Dist. v Sandpebble Builders, Inc.*, 66 AD3d 122 [2d Dept 2009]). It is well-settled law that "[o]ne of the primary and completely legitimate purposes of incorporating is to limit or eliminate the personal liability of corporate principals" (*Matter of Goldman v Chapman*, 44 AD3d 938 [2d Dept 2007]). "[P]iercing the corporate veil requires a showing that: (1) the owners exercised complete domination of the corporation in respect to the transaction attacked; and (2) that such domination was used to commit a fraud or wrong against the plaintiff which resulted in plaintiff's injury" (*Morris v. New York State Dep't of Tax'n & Fin.*, 82 NY2d 135 [1993]).

Here, in support of his motion for an order granting summary judgment in his favor and dismissing the complaint and cross-claims as against him individually, Almahmoud submits testimony and documentary evidence to demonstrate that he was acting in his corporate capacity, not his individual capacity. Specifically, Almahmoud submits his deposition testimony whereby he attested that he was the president of 399 Sunrise and Tile Expo; that 399 Sunrise was the owner of

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

the Premises; that Tile Expo contracted with non-party PMF Steel to install steel columns at the Premises; that he only acted in his corporate capacity; and, that the construction project at issue herein was conducted through Tile Expo. Moreover, Almahmoud submits a Bargain and Sale Deed indicating that the Premises was owned by 399 Sunrise, as well as a Project Proposal from PMF Steel, made out to Tile Expo. Thus, Almahmoud has met his prima facie burden of demonstrating that he was acting in his corporate capacity, not his individual capacity. Plaintiff's argument that Almahmoud's signature on the building permit application is indicative of his personal liability is contradicted by the building permit, which is issued to 399 Sunrise,³ as owner, and Tile Expo, as contractor. Absent any allegation that Almahmoud exercised complete dominion over either 399 Sunrise or Tile Expo, and that such complete dominion was utilized to commit fraud or any other wrong there is no basis to pierce the corporate veil. Therefore, Almahmoud is entitled to an order granting summary judgment and dismissing the complaint and any cross-claim as against him individually.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED, that Plaintiff's request for partial summary judgment imposing liability pursuant to Labor Law § 240(1) is hereby **DENIED**; and, it is

ORDERED, that the corporate Defendants' request for summary judgment dismissing Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 240(1) is hereby **DENIED**; and, it is

ORDERED, that Plaintiff's request for partial summary judgment imposing liability pursuant to Labor Law § 241(6) is hereby **DENIED**; and, it is

ORDERED, that the corporate Defendants' request for summary judgment dismissing Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 241(6) is hereby **DENIED**; and, it is

ORDERED, that Defendants' request for summary judgment dismissing Plaintiff's claim for liability pursuant to Labor Law § 200; or, alternatively, under a theory of common law negligence, is hereby **GRANTED** to the extent the claim involves the manner in which the work is performed; and, it is

3

Although the permit indicates Three 99 Sunrise, Almahmoud's testimony clarifies that Three 99 Sunrise and 399 Sunrise are the same company; and, in any event, Almahmoud is not named, individually, as the owner.

CARBAJAL v. 399 SUNRISE HWY
Index No.: 601176/20

ORDERED, that Defendant **FADI ALMAHMOUD a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD'S** request for summary judgment is hereby **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's complaint and any cross-claims as against Defendant **FADI ALMAHMOUD a/k/a FADI MAHMOUD**, individually, are hereby **DISMISSED**.

ORDERED, that all requests for relief not addressed herein are **DENIED**.

This shall constitute the Decision and Order of the Court.

Dated: August 1, 2023
Mineola, NY, 11501

ENTER:


HON. ERICA L. PRAGER, J.S.C.

ENTERED

Aug 02 2023

F:\DECISIONS 2023\CARBAJAL v 399 SUNRISE HWY (601176-20) (08/2, 003, 004, 005) [BF].wpd

NASSAU COUNTY
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE