

**Matter of Bartow v New York City Taxi & Limousine
Comm.**

2026 NY Slip Op 30180(U)

January 13, 2026

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: Index No. 165646/2025

Judge: Hasa A. Kingo

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. HASA A. KINGO PART 05M

Justice

-----X

INDEX NO. 165646/2025

IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION OF MAILE BARTOW

MOTION DATE 12/03/2025

Petitioner,

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001

- v -

THE NEW YORK CITY TAXI & LIMOUSINE COMMISSION,

**DECISION + ORDER ON
MOTION**

Respondent.

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 2, 8, 9, 10 were read on this motion to/for LEAVE TO FILE.

Upon the foregoing documents, Petitioner Maile Bartow’s (“Petitioner”) petition for leave to serve a late notice of claim pursuant to General Municipal Law § 50-e is granted without opposition.

Pursuant to General Municipal Law § 50-i, no action sounding in tort may be commenced against the City unless a notice of claim was served upon it within ninety (90) days after the subject claim arose (General Municipal Law §§ 50-i [a], 50[e]). “The purpose of the notice of claim is to alert the municipality to the existence of the claim so that it can promptly investigate and preserve any relevant evidence before the passage of time renders such evidence unavailable or lessens its probative value” (*Jaime v City of New York*, 41 NY3d 531, 539 [2024]). As such, the notice of claim must state “the time when, the place where and the manner in which the claim arose” (General Municipal Law § 50-e[2]). The notice of claim “was not meant to be used as a sword to cut down honest claims, but merely as a shield to protect municipalities against spurious ones” (*Goodwin v New York City Hous. Auth.*, 42 AD3d 63, 66 [1st Dept 2007]). Because of its remedial nature, the statute must be liberally construed (*see Camacho v City of New York*, 187 AD2d 262

[1st Dept 1992]) and “should not operate as a device to frustrate the rights of individuals with legitimate claims” (*Matter of Porcaro v City of New York*, 20 AD3d 357 [1st Dept 2005]).

Courts, in their discretion, may extend the time to serve a late notice (General Municipal Law § 50-e[5]). “In determining whether to grant or deny leave to serve a late notice of claim, courts must consider ‘in particular’ whether the municipality acquired actual knowledge of the essential facts constituting the claim within [ninety days of the claim’s accrual] or within a reasonable time thereafter” (*Jaime*, 41 NY3d at 540). “Courts are to place ‘great weight’ on this factor [and] the party seeking leave has the burden of establishing [actual knowledge] through the submission of nonspeculative evidence” (*id.*). “Generally, knowledge of essential facts as to time and place by an actor in a position to investigate will suffice” (*id.*). Other factors to be considered include the reasonableness of the excuse offered for the delay in filing and whether the municipality would be substantially prejudiced because the claimant did not file during the statutory period (*Corwin v City of New York*, 141 AD3d 484, 489 [1st Dept 2016]).

In this instance, Petitioner met her burden by demonstrating that Respondent the New York City Taxi & Limousine Commission (the “City”) acquired the essential facts underlying Petitioner’s claims within the statutory period and will therefore not be prejudiced by the late service. Specifically, Petitioner demonstrated that the City acquired the essential facts underlying her claims four days after the subject incident occurred when the New York City Police Department engaged the TLC Police Uniformed Services Bureau Special Investigations Unit for the purpose of investigating Petitioner’s allegations that she was sexually assaulted by a Medallion Taxicab driver (NYSCEF Doc No. 6; NYSCEF Doc No. 1, verified petition ¶ 20).¹ Critically, the investigative report includes factual findings, such as, the subject vehicle “is not equipped with an

¹ Petitioner was purportedly assaulted on November 10, 2024, and the investigatory document is dated November 14, 2024 (NYSCEF Doc No. 1, NYSCEF Doc No. 6).

interior safety partition” and that “because it lacks an interior safety partition, TLC rules require [the subject vehicle] to be equipped with an interior-facing camera system” (NYSCEF Doc No. 6). Thus, within days of the assault, the City was apprised of not only the factual predicate underlying Petitioner’s claims, but also potential theories of liability (NYSCEF Doc No. 1, verified petition ¶ 7-8). Moreover, Petitioner believes that “following the [taxi driver’s arrest] the TLC took disciplinary action against [him] for his unlawful conduct [. . .] which resulted in him not being able to drive a TLC licensed vehicle for a specific period of time” (*id.* ¶ 20). As such, the City has been afforded a meaningful opportunity to timely investigate and preserve evidence that is relevant to its defense. Finally, Petitioner contends that because the City was made aware of the essential facts underlying Petitioner’s claim within four days of the incident, and specifically that they were made aware through their own investigation, that the City will not be prejudiced by the late filing.

On balance, the court finds that these facts and circumstances, including the gravity of the allegations, weigh heavily in favor of allowing this case to proceed on its merits. Significantly, the petition is unopposed, and the City has therefore not advanced any arguments to the contrary (*Goodwin*, 42 AD3d at 68 [“prejudice will not be presumed” and “may not be shown without evidence of an attempt to investigate”]). Thus, in the absence of prejudice and where the City has timely acquired the essential facts underpinning Petitioner’s claims, the motion is granted (*see Jordan v City of New York*, 41 AD3d 658, 660 [2d Dept 2007] [“Since the City acquired timely knowledge of the essential facts of the claim, the plaintiff met his initial burden of showing a lack of prejudice”]).

Therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that Petitioner’s request for leave to serve a late notice of claim is granted; and it is further

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the notice of claim in the form annexed to the moving papers as Exhibit C (NYSCEF Doc No. 5) is deemed served *nunc pro tunc* upon the City of New York as of the date of entry of this order, provided that Petitioner shall within twenty (20) days serve the notice of claim in accordance with General Municipal Law § 50-e(3); and it is further

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that Petitioner shall commence an action and purchase a new index number in the event a lawsuit arising from this notice of claim is filed.

This constitutes the decision, order, and judgment of the court.

1/13/2026
DATE

HASA A. KINGO, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:

- CASE DISPOSED
- GRANTED DENIED

- NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
- GRANTED IN PART OTHER

APPLICATION:

- SETTLE ORDER
- INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

- SUBMIT ORDER
- FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT REFERENCE

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE: