

**Raziel v Nikon Inc.**

2024 NY Slip Op 35131(U)

December 11, 2024

Supreme Court, Suffolk County

Docket Number: Index No. 615891/2022

Judge: Joseph A. Santorelli

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.

SHORT FORM ORDER

INDEX No. 615891/2022  
CAL No. \_\_\_\_\_

SUPREME COURT - STATE OF NEW YORK  
I.A.S. PART 10 - SUFFOLK COUNTY

**PRESENT:**

Hon. JOSEPH A. SANTORELLI  
Justice of the Supreme Court

MOTION DATE 08/01/2024  
SUBMIT DATE 10/31/2024  
Mot. Seq. # 01 - Mot D

-----X

SHARRON RAZIEL,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NIKON INC., JOHN P. BROWNE, V.P., THE  
LONG ISLAND FINANCIAL CENTER  
ASSOCIATION, INC., CLK-HP 300  
BROADHOLLOW LLC, and CUSHMAN &  
WAKEFIELD, INC.,

Defendants.

**KASTON & ABERLE, LLP**

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
259 Mineola Boulevard  
Mineola, NY 11501

**MARSHALL DENNEHEY, P.C.**

*Attorneys for Defendant Nikon Inc.*  
175 Pinelawn Road, Suite 250  
Melville, NY 11747

**WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN &  
DICKER, LLP**

*Attorneys for Defendant The Long Island Financial  
Center Association, Inc.*  
1133 Westchester Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10604

**COFFEY MODICA LLP**

*Attorneys for Defendant CLK-HP 300 Broadhollow LLC*  
205 E Post Road, Suite 210  
White Plains, NY 10601

**HANNUM FERETIC PRENDERGAST &  
MERLINO, LLC**

*Attorneys for Defendant Cushman & Wakefield, Inc.*  
55 Broadway, Suite 202  
New York, NY 10006

-----X

Upon the following papers numbered 50 - 62, 65 - 67, & 70 - 74 read on this motion for summary judgment; Notice of Motion/ Order to Show Cause and supporting papers 50 - 62; ~~Notice of Cross Motion and supporting papers \_\_\_\_\_~~; Answering Affidavits and supporting papers 65 - 66, 70, & 72; Replying Affidavits and supporting papers 67, 71, & 73 - 74; ~~Other \_\_\_\_\_~~; (and after hearing counsel in support and opposed to the motion) it is,

Defendant Cushman & Wakefield, Inc., seeks an order pursuant to CPLR 3212 granting summary judgment dismissing the complaint and any and all cross claims asserted against it and granting summary judgment for contractual indemnification against defendant The Long Island Financial Center Association, Inc. The plaintiff and co-defendants, The Long Island Financial Center Association, Inc. (hereinafter

Raziel v. Nikon, Inc., et al.

Index # 615891/2022

Page 2

“LIFCA”) and CLK-HP 300 Broadhollow LLC, have filed opposition to the application arguing that discovery has not been completed.

The plaintiff, Sharron Raziel, seeks recovery of damages for personal injuries sustained as the result of a trip and fall accident that occurred on the sidewalk at or near the property located at 1300 Walt Whitman Road, County of Suffolk, at 3:30 p.m. on July 28, 2021. The plaintiff claims that, “[t]he accident occurred while plaintiff was walking when she was caused to fall due to a defective condition which consisted of a large, raised, broken, defective section of the sidewalk caused by the defendant’s failure to properly maintain the premises.” Moving defendant Cushman & Wakefield, Inc. entered into an agreement in January 1990 with defendant LIFCA, the owner of the subject premises, wherein Cushman was appointed agent for the management of the common areas and common facilities at the property. However, Cushman now argues that by the time of the plaintiff’s accident in July 2021, Cushman’s role was strictly limited to providing financial/accounting services for LIFCA and had not provided any maintenance or repair work at the property for many years. Defendant Cushman thus contends that it had no duties with respect to care and maintenance and owed no duty of care to the plaintiff at the time of her accident. The plaintiff and co-defendants argue that no depositions have been held and defendant Cushman’s argument that it has no liability despite its contractual duty is premature. The plaintiff and co-defendants also contend that there are triable issues of fact as to the assessment of liability against the defendants, including the exact location of the accident and the entities responsible for the maintenance of the area.

CPLR §3212(b) states that a motion for summary judgment “shall be supported by affidavit, by a copy of the pleadings and by other available proof, such as depositions and written admission.” If an attorney lacks personal knowledge of the events giving rise to the cause of action or defense, his ancillary affidavit, repeating the allegations or the pleadings, without setting forth evidentiary facts, cannot support or defeat a motion by summary judgment (*Olan v. Farrell Lines, Inc.*, 105 AD 2d 653, 481 NYS 2d 370 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept., 1984; aff’d 64 NY 2d 1092, 489 NYS 2d 884 (1985); *Spearman v. Times Square Stores Corp.*, 96 AD 2d 552, 465 NYS 2d 230 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dept., 1983); Weinstein-Korn-Miller, *New York Civil Practice* Sec. 3212.09)).

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 (*Friends of Animals v Associated Fur Mfrs.*, 46 NY2d 1065, 416 NYS2d 790 [1979]). To grant summary judgment it must clearly appear that no material and triable issue of fact is presented (*Sillman v Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation*, 3 NY2d 395, 165 NYS2d 498 [1957]). Once such proof has been offered, the burden then shifts to the opposing party, who, in order to defeat the motion for summary judgment, must proffer evidence in admissible form . . . and must “show facts sufficient to require a trial of any issue of fact” CPLR3212 [b]; *Gilbert Frank Corp. v Federal Insurance Co.*, 70 NY2d 966, 525 NYS2d 793, 520 NE2d 512 [1988]; *Zuckerman v City of New York*, 49 NY2d 557, 427 NYS2d 595 [1980]). The opposing party must assemble, lay bare and reveal his proof in order to establish that the matters set forth in his pleadings are real and capable of being established (*Castro v Liberty Bus Co.*, 79 AD2d 1014, 435 NYS2d 340 [2d Dept 1981]). Furthermore, the evidence submitted in connection with a

Raziel v. Nikon, Inc., et al.  
Index # 615891/2022  
Page 3

motion for summary judgment should be viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion (*Robinson v Strong Memorial Hospital*, 98 AD2d 976, 470 NYS2d 239 [4th Dept 1983]).

On a motion for summary judgment the court is not to determine credibility, but whether there exists a factual issue (see *S.J. Capelin Associates v Globe Mfg. Corp.*, 34 NY2d 338, 357 NYS2d 478, 313 NE2d 776 [1974]). However, the court must also determine whether the factual issues presented are genuine or unsubstantiated (*Prunty v Keltie's Bum Steer*, 163 AD2d 595, 559 NYS2d 354 [2d Dept 1990]). If the issue claimed to exist is not genuine but is feigned and there is nothing to be tried, then summary judgment should be granted (*Prunty v Keltie's Bum Steer*, *supra*, citing *Glick & Dolleck v Tri-Pac Export Corp.*, 22 NY2d 439, 293 NYS2d 93, 239 NE2d 725 [1968]; *Columbus Trust Co. v Campolo*, 110 AD2d 616, 487 NYS2d 105 [2d Dept 1985], *affd*, 66 NY2d 701, 496 NYS2d 425, 487 NE2d 282).

In *Colombini v Westchester County Healthcare Corp.*, 24 AD3d 712, 715 [2d Dept 2005], the Court held that

Summary judgment should be denied as premature where, as here, the party opposing the motion has not had an adequate opportunity to conduct discovery (see CPLR 3212 [f]; *Ross v Curtis-Palmer Hydro-Elec. Co.*, 81 NY2d 494, 506, 618 NE2d 82, 601 NYS2d 49 [1993]; *OK Petroleum Distrib. Corp. v Nassau/Suffolk Fuel Oil Corp.*, 17 AD3d 551, 793 NYS2d 152 [2005]; *Mazzola v Kelly*, 291 AD2d 535, 738 NYS2d 246 [2002]).

The Court in *Gardner v Cason, Inc.*, 82 AD3d 930, 931-932 [2d Dept 2011], held

It was premature to award summary judgment at this stage of the case. "This is especially so where the opposing party has not had a reasonable opportunity for disclosure prior to the making of the motion" (*Baron v Incorporated Vil. of Freeport*, 143 AD2d 792, 793, 533 NYS2d 143 [1988]). The plaintiff and the defendant Grumbly submitted, among other things, affidavits containing discrepancies pertaining to the circumstances of the accident, including as to the decedent's culpability. Furthermore, no depositions have been conducted, including any depositions of key eyewitnesses identified in the police accident report. Accordingly, the Supreme Court should have denied the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on the issue of liability with leave to renew after the completion of discovery (see *Gruenfeld v City of New Rochelle*, 72 AD3d 1025, 900 NYS2d 144 [2010]; *Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v LaMattina & Assoc., Inc.*, 59 AD3d 578, 872 NYS2d 724 [2009]; *Martinez v Ashley Apts. Co., LLC*, 44 AD3d 830, 842 NYS2d 918 [2007]; *Tyme v City of New York*, 22 AD3d 571, 801 NYS2d 744 [2005]; see generally CPLR

Raziel v. Nikon, Inc., et al.  
Index # 615891/2022  
Page 4

3212 [f]).

Based upon a review of the motion papers the Court concludes that the plaintiff and co-defendants have not had an adequate opportunity to conduct discovery into issues within the knowledge of defendant Cushman & Wakefield, Inc. as to the agreement between Cushman and LIFCA, and the duties of Cushman with regard to the subject property at the time of the plaintiff's accident. Thus the motion for summary judgment on the issue of liability is denied with leave to renew after the completion of discovery.

The foregoing constitutes the decision and Order of the Court.

Dated: December 11, 2024

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JOSEPH A. SANTORELLI  
J.S.C.

\_\_\_ FINAL DISPOSITION     X  NON-FINAL DISPOSITION