

NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT
COUNTY OF ERIE

TROY SHANE SMITH and ALLYSON JANE SMITH,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GREENE TWEED'S
ANSWER TO SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT

84 LUMBER COMPANY, *et al*, including GREENE
TWEED & CO., INC.,

Index No.: 814633/2023

Defendants.

Defendant, GREENE TWEED & CO., INC., Individually (hereinafter "Greene Tweed") appearing by its attorneys, Jordan DiPalma PLLC, for its Answer to the Second Amended Complaint, answers and alleges upon information and belief as follows:

As to the new allegations contained in the Second Amended Complaint, Greene Tweed answers and alleges as follows:

1. In response to the allegations in plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint that Greene Tweed, repeats, reiterates, realleges and incorporates herein by reference, all allegations, denials, defenses and cross-claims raised in its Verified Answer to plaintiff's original Complaint dated January 24, 2024, as if fully incorporated herein.
2. Denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 4 and 6 of the Second Amended Complaint.
3. Denies the allegations as to Greene Tweed and denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Second Amended Complaint.
4. Denies each and every other allegation of the Second Amended Complaint not hereinbefore specifically admitted, denied or otherwise controverted.

AS AND FOR ITS FIRST SEPARATE AND COMPLETE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

5. All claims are time-barred by the applicable statute of limitations.

AS AND FOR A SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

6. The causes of action pleaded in the Second Amended Complaint have not been maintained in a timely fashion and have been neglected and should be barred by the doctrine of laches.

AS AND FOR A THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

7. All claims brought under the New York statute of limitations enacted July 31, 1986 are time-barred in that the statute is unconstitutional.

AS AND FOR A FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

8. In the event it should appear that the plaintiff was employed by the answering defendant, then plaintiffs' sole and exclusive remedy is under the Worker's Compensation Law of the State of New York.

AS AND FOR A FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

9. Insofar as the Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action considered separately, may allege a cause of action accruing before September 1, 1975, each such cause of action is barred by reason of the culpable conduct attributable to plaintiff, including contributory negligence and assumption of the risk.

AS AND FOR A SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

10. Insofar as the Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action considered separately, alleges a cause of action to recover damages for personal injuries which accrued on or after September 1, 1975, the amount of damages recoverable thereon must be diminished by reason of the culpable conduct attributable to each plaintiff, including contributory negligence and assumption of the risk, in the proportion which the culpable conduct attributable to either plaintiff bears on the total conduct which caused the alleged damages.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

11. While this answering defendant denies plaintiffs' allegations with regard to liability, to the extent that plaintiffs may be able to prove same, such liability was the result of intervening or interceding acts of superseding negligence on the part of third-parties, over which the answering defendant had neither control, nor right of control.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

12. At all times the answering defendant used proper methods in manufacturing its products in conformity with the available knowledge and research of the defendant and the scientific and industrial community.

AS AND FOR A NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

13. If it should be proven at the time of trial that any of the products of the answering defendant were furnished to the employer of plaintiff, or to the United States government, and that the plaintiff thereafter came into contact with those products, which is specifically denied, then any such product was furnished in strict conformity to the conditions specified, or to the specifications furnished, by the United States government and/or the employer/employers of plaintiff.

AS AND FOR A TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

14. Should it be proven at the time of trial that the answering defendant is subject to market share liability, then this answering defendant's share of such liability would be of such a *de minimus* amount as to make its contribution for damages negligible and speculative and this answering defendant would be entitled to contribution, whether in whole or in part, from the co-defendants.

AS AND FOR AN ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

15. Upon information and belief, the plaintiffs failed to mitigate or otherwise act to lessen or reduce the injuries and disability alleged in the Second Amended Complaint.

AS AND FOR A TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

16. Plaintiffs' causes of action seeking punitive damages are barred because such damages are not recoverable and not warranted in this action against this answering defendant.

AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

17. The plaintiffs contributed to the claimed illness and injury, either in whole or in part, by the use of other substances, products, medications, and drugs.

AS AND FOR A FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

18. Upon information and belief, the plaintiffs have commenced other actions for the same injuries and damages alleged in this action, and should plaintiffs recover damages in those other actions, the defendant will be entitled to a reduction of damages herein or a proportional offset pursuant to General Obligations Law §15-108 as may be appropriate.

AS AND FOR A FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

19. The defendant claims limitation of liability pursuant to CPLR Article 16.

AS AND FOR A SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

20. Upon information and belief, the plaintiff, his co-workers, employees, and others, misused, abused, mistreated and misapplied the product designated as "asbestos material" as alleged in the Second Amended Complaint herein.

21. If the Court finds that any misuse, abuse, mistreatment and/or misapplication of the product caused and/or contributed to the alleged damages or injuries of the plaintiff, then the answering defendant requests that the amount of damages which might be recoverable shall be diminished by the proportion which the same misuse, abuse, mistreatment and/or misapplication attributed to the plaintiff, his co-workers, employees, and others bears to the conduct which caused the alleged damages and/or injuries.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

22. As to the causes of action pleaded in plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint which are based upon express or implied representations and/or warranties, such causes of action are legally insufficient, as against the answering defendant, by reason of their failure to allege privity of contract between the plaintiff and the answering defendant.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, THIS ANSWERING DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

23. The plaintiff did not directly or indirectly purchase any asbestos containing products or materials from the answering defendant and plaintiffs neither received, nor relied upon any representations allegedly made by the answering defendant.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.