

Woodman v Tennis League Network

2025 NY Slip Op 34301(U)

November 10, 2025

Supreme Court, Kings County

Docket Number: Index No. 519387/2025

Judge: Gina Abadi

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.

At an IAS Term, Part 18 of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of Kings, at the Courthouse thereof at 360 Adams Street, Brooklyn, New York, on the 10th day of November, 2025.

P R E S E N T:

HON. GINA ABADI,
J.S.C.

CAMERON "CAMMIE" WOODMAN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Index No.: 519387/2025
Motion Seq: 1-2

THE TENNIS LEAGUE NETWORK,
STEVEN CHAGNON, and
MARGARET HUFFMAN,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Recitation, as required by CPLR § 2219(a), of the papers considered in the review of these motions:

<u>Papers</u>	<u>NYSCEF Numbered</u>
Notice of Motion/Cross Motion/Order to Show Cause and Affidavits (Affirmations) Annexed	<u>11 – 18; 21 – 25</u>
Opposing Affidavits (Affirmations)	<u>28; 29</u>
Reply Affidavits (Affirmations)	<u>31; 32</u>
Other.....	

Upon the foregoing cited papers and after oral argument:

In Motion Seq. No. 1, the joint pre-answer motion of defendants The Tennis League Network and Steven Chagnon (collectively, the Chagnon defendants) for an order, pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (1) and (7), dismissing the verified complaint of plaintiff Cameron "Cammie" Woodman (plaintiff) as against them is *granted to the extent* that plaintiff's ninth and tenth causes of action against Steven Chagnon for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, respectively, are dismissed for failure to state a claim under CPLR 3211 (a) (7), and the remainder of the Chagnon defendants' motion is denied.

In Motion Seq. No. 2, the pre-answer motion of defendant Margaret Huffman (Huffman) for an order, pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (7), dismissing plaintiff's complaint as against her is *granted to the extent* that plaintiff's eighth cause of action against her for intentional infliction of emotional distress is dismissed for failure to state a claim under CPLR 3211 (a) (7), and the remainder of Huffman's motion is denied.

The complaint sufficiently alleges in the first, second, fourth, and fifth causes of action that the applicable Chagnon defendants violated each of the New York State Human Rights Law (as amended by L 2019, ch 160, § 6) (State HRL) and the New York City Human Rights Law (as amended by Local Law No. 85 of 2005) (City HRL) by discriminating against plaintiff: (1) on the basis of "gender identity or expression" in connection with a "place of public accommodation, resort or amusement" (Executive Law § 292 [35] and [9], respectively) in the instance of the State HRL, and (2) on the basis of "gender" in connection with a "place or provider of public accommodation" (Administrative Code, § 8-102 [definitions]) in the instance of the City HRL.¹ *See Matter of U.S. Power Squadrons v State Human Rights Appeal Bd.*, 59 NY2d 401, 410-412 (1983), *rearg dismissed* 60 NY2d 682 and 702 (1983); *Matter of Gifford v McCarthy*, 137 AD3d

¹ As the Second Judicial Department explained in a recent decision:

"The standards for establishing unlawful discrimination under the [State HRL] previously were the same as those governing title VII cases. In 2019, however, the New York State Legislature amended the [State HRL], in pertinent part, to require that it 'be construed liberally for the accomplishment of the remedial purposes thereof, regardless of whether federal civil rights laws, including those laws with provisions worded comparably to the provisions of this article, have been so construed' (Executive Law § 300; L 2019, ch 160, § 6). That amendment was effective August 12, 2019 (see L 2019, ch 160, § 16), and applies to causes of action, like the instant cause of action, that are filed on or after the effective date (see *id.* § 16 [d]).

As a result of the amendment, the [State HRL] now aligns with the standards of the New York City Human Rights Law. . . ."

Wright v White Plains Hosp. Med. Ctr., 237 AD3d 1143, 1144-1145 (2d Dept 2025) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

30, 35-36 (3d Dept 2016); *New York Roadrunners Club v State Div. of Human Rights*, 81 AD2d 519, 519-20 (1st Dept 1981), *affd on other grounds* 55 NY2d 122 (1982); *Sullivan v BDG Media, Inc.*, 71 Misc 3d 863, 869-871 (Sup Ct, NY County 2021). *See also Matter of Cahill v Rosa*, 89 NY2d 14, 19-24 (1996). *See generally Bostock v Clayton County, Georgia*, 590 US 644, 653 (2020) (“When the express terms of a statute give us one answer and extratextual considerations suggest another, it’s no contest. Only the written word is the law, and all persons are entitled to its benefit.”).

Further, the complaint sufficiently alleges that Huffman is liable to plaintiff under the third and sixth causes of action for aiding and abetting the Chagnon defendants’ discriminatory conduct under the State HRL and City HRL, respectively. *See Elco v Aguiar*, 226 AD3d 649, 651 (2d Dept 2024); *D’Amico v Commodities Exch. Inc.*, 235 AD2d 313, 314-315 (1st Dept 1997).

Conversely, the remaining causes of action of the complaint – the eighth, ninth, and tenth causes of action² – each fail to state a claim for intentional and/or emotional infliction of emotional distress against either Huffman or Chagnon, as applicable. *See Chanko v American Broadcasting Cos. Inc.*, 27 NY3d 46, 56-58 (2016); *Poliah v Westchester County Country Club, Inc.*, 14 AD3d 601, 601 (2d Dept 2005); *Albert v Solimon*, 252 AD2d 139, 141 (4th Dept 1998), *affd* 94 NY2d 771, 772 (1999). *See also Sacino v Warwick Val. Cent. School Dist.*, 138 AD3d 717, 719 (2d Dept 2016); *Daluise v Sottile*, 40 AD3d 801, 803-804 (2d Dept 2007).

² The seventh cause of action for defamation was discontinued by the parties’ stipulation (NYSCEF Doc No. 24).

Contrary to the Chagnon defendants' contention, Steven Chagnon's affidavit does not conclusively establish that plaintiff has no cause of action against either of them. *See Lawrence v Graubard Miller*, 11 NY3d 588, 595 (2008); *Phillips v Taco Bell Corp.*, 152 AD3d 806, 807-808 (2d Dept 2017).

Plaintiff's counsel is directed to electronically serve a copy of this Decision and Order with notice of entry on the other parties' respective counsel and to electronically file an affidavit of service thereof with the Kings County Clerk.

Pursuant to CPLR 3211 (f), the Chagnon defendants' and Hoffman's respective time to answer the extant portions of the complaint is extended until ten days from the electronic service of this Decision and Order with notice of entry by plaintiff's counsel on the other parties' respective counsel.

The parties' remaining contentions are either moot or need not be reached in light of the Court's determination. All relief not expressly granted herein is denied.

The foregoing constitutes the Decision and Order of this Court.

ENTER,



HON. GINA ABADI
J. S. C.