

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X  
MILAGROS MUSSE,

Index No.: 158546/2015

Plaintiff,

-against-

TRIBOROUGH BRIDGE and TUNNEL AUTHORITY  
and PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK and NEW  
JERSEY,

Defendants.  
-----X

MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON  
BEHALF OF DEFENDANT, PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK and NEW JERSEY

**RUBIN FIORELLA FRIEDMAN  
& MERCANTE, LLP**

*Attorneys for Defendant,*

*PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK and  
NEW JERSEY*

630 Third Avenue – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

New York, New York 10017

212.953.2381

Our File No.: 1013.40676

Of counsel:

Stewart B. Greenspan, Esq.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION .....1

ARUGUMENT.....3

POINT I

AS PLAINTIFF’S INJURIES DID NOT INVOLVE A GRAVITY RELATED RISK,  
 PLAINTIFF’S LABOR LAW §240(1) CLAIM MUST BE DISMISSED .....3

POINT II

DEFENDANT PANYNJ IS NOT AN OWNER, CONTRACTOR OR AGENT FOR  
 PURPOSES OF LABOR LAW §§240(1); 241(6) AND 200.....6

POINT III

EVEN ASSUMING, ARGUENDO, THAT PANYNJ WAS A PROPER LABOR LAW  
 DEFENDANT IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS CASE, NONE OF THE INDUSTRIAL CODE  
 PROVISIONS RELIED UPON BY PLAINTIFF HAS ANY APPLICATION TO THE FACTS  
 OF THE ACCIDENT ALLEGED .....11

POINT IV

PANYNJ MAY NOT BE HELD LIABLE UNDER LABOR LAW §200 SINCE IT NEITHER  
 CREATED THE CONDITION ALLEGED, NOR HAD NOTICE OF IT, ACTUAL OR  
 CONSTRUCTIVE .....16

POINT V

AN OUT OF POSSESSION LANDOWNER SUCH AS PANYNJ CAN ONLY BE CHARGED  
 WITH CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE OF A HAZARDOUS CONDITION WHERE THE  
 LANDOWNER RETAINED THE RIGHT TO RE-ENTER THE PREMISES, AND THE  
 HAZARD CONSTITUTED A SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL OR DESIGN DEFECT THAT  
 IS CONTRARY TO A SPECIFIC STATUTORY SAFETY PROVISION .....17

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Abbatiello v. Lancaster Studio Assocs.</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 46, 52, 814 N.E.2d 784, 781 N.Y.S.2d 477 [2004]).....	7
<i>Becerra v. City of New York</i> , 261 A.D.2d 188, 690 N.Y.S.2d 52 (1 <sup>st</sup> Dept. 1999).....	3
<i>Bland v. Manocherian</i> , 66 N.Y.2d 452, 488 N.E.2d 810, 497 N.Y.S.2d 880 (1985) .....	3
<i>Brown v. Christopher Street Owners Corporation</i> , 211AD2d 441, 442, 620 N.Y.S.2d 374 [1 <sup>st</sup> Dept 1995] affd 87 NY2d 938, 663 N.E.2d 1251, 641 N.Y.S.2d 221 2008 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 7790, 2008 NY Slip Op 30421(U)[1996] .....	7
<i>Butler v. Rafferty</i> , 100 NY2d 265, 792 N.E.2d 1055, 762 N.Y.S.2d 567 [2003].....	17
<i>Ceballos v. Kaufman</i> , 249 AD2d 40, 40, 671 N.Y.S.2d 229 [1 <sup>st</sup> Dept 1998].....	7
<i>Chapman v. Silber</i> , 97 NY2d 9, 760 N.E.2d 329, 734 N.Y.S.2d 541 [2001].....	17
<i>Constantino v. Kreisler Borg Florman Gen. Constr. Co.</i> , 272 AD2d 361, 362, 707 NYS2d 487 [2000] .....	12
<i>Conte v. Frelen Assoc., LLC</i> , 51 AD3d 620 [2 <sup>d</sup> Dept 2008] .....	20
<i>Cooke v. CRP/Extell Parcell I. LP</i> , 2012 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 92, 2012 WL 760498 (NY Sup), 2012 NY Slip Op 30492[U] (Trial Order) [Sup Ct, NY County 2012] .....	14, 15
<i>Copertino v. Ward</i> , 100 AD2d 565, 566, 473 N.Y.S.2d 494 [1984] .....	8
<i>Dahar v. Holland Ladder &amp; Mfg. Co.</i> , 79 AD3d 1631, 1633, 914 N.Y.S.2d 817 [2010]) .....	8

<i>Devlin v. Blaggards III Rest. Corp.</i> , 80 AD3d 497, 916 N.Y.S.2d 580 [1st Dept. 2011], lv. den.,16 N.Y.3d 713, 948 N.E.2d 929, 924 N.Y.S.2d 322 [2011]) .....	18
<i>Douglas v. Sherwood 48 Assoc., LP</i> 2017 NY Slip Op 31721[U] [Sup Ct, Bronx County 2017]) .....	4
<i>Flores v ERC Holding LLC</i> , 87 AD3d 419, 421, 928 N.Y.S.2d 7 [2011] .....	9, 10
<i>Guclu v. 900 Eighth Ave. Condominium, LLC</i> , 81 AD3d 592, 593, 916 N.Y.S.2d 147 [2011].....	8
<i>Heim v. Trustees of Columbia Univ.</i> , 81 AD3d 507, 917 N.Y.S.2d 159 [1st Dept. 2011] .....	18
<i>Jean-Baptiste v. 153 Manhattan Ave. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.</i> , 124 AD3d 476, 2 N.Y.S.3d 441 [1st Dept. 2015] .....	18
<i>John v. Baharestani</i> , 281 AD2d 114, 118, 721 N.Y.S.2d 625 [1st Dept 2001] .....	5
<i>Johnson v. Urena Service Center</i> , 227 AD2d 325, 642 N.Y.S.2d 897 [1st Dept. 1996] .....	17, 18
<i>Jones v. Granite Constr. Northeast, Inc.</i> , 2011 NY Slip Op 31434[U] [Sup Ct, Queens County 2011] .....	14
<i>Kilimnik v. Mirage Rest.</i> , 223 AD2d 530 [2d Dept 1996] .....	20
<i>Lawyer v. Hoffman</i> , 275 AD2d 541, 542, 711 NYS2d 618 [2000] .....	12
<i>Lester v. JD Carlisle Dev. Corp.</i> , 2016 NY Slip Op 31502[U] [Sup Ct, NY County 2016] .....	14
<i>Maggio v. 24 W. 57 APF, LLC</i> , 134 AD3d 621 [1st Dept 2015] .....	17
<i>Maragliano v. Port Auth. of NY &amp; NJ</i> , 2012 NY Slip Op 30374[U] [Sup Ct, Queens County 2012] .....	8
<i>Marchese v. Fresh Meadows Assocs.</i> , 207 A.D.2d 871, 616 N.Y.S.2d 767 [2nd Dept. 1994] .....	19

<i>Maynard v. DeCurtis</i> , 252 AD2d 908, 909, 676 NYS2d 340 [1998] .....	12
<i>McComish v. Luciano's Italian Rest.</i> , 56 AD3d 534 [2d Dept 2008] .....	19, 20
<i>McKee v. Great Atl. &amp; Pac. Tea Co.</i> , 73 AD3d 872 [2d Dept 2010] .....	12
<i>Melber v. 6333 Main St., Inc.</i> , 91 NY2d 759, 763, 698 N.E.2d 933, 676 N.Y.S.2d 104 [1998] .....	5
<i>Mercorella v. Manmall, LLC</i> , 2008 NY Slip Op 32879[U] [Sup Ct, NY County 2008] .....	5, 6
<i>Morra v. White</i> , 276 AD2d 536, 714 NYS2d 510 [2000] .....	12
<i>Morton v. State of New York</i> , 15 NY3d 50, 50, 930 N.E.2d 271, 904 N.Y.S.2d 350 [2010] .....	7
<i>Nielsen v. 300 East 76th Street Partners, LLC</i> 111 AD3d 414, 414, 974 N.Y.S.2d 246 [1st Dept. 2013].....	18
<i>Nieves v. Five Boro A. C. &amp; Refrig. Corp.</i> , 93 NY2d 914, 915-916, 712 N.E.2d 1219, 690 N.Y.S.2d 852 [1999] .....	6
<i>Peralta v. Henriquez</i> , 100 NY2d 139, 790 N.E.2d 1170, 760 N.Y.S.2d 741 [2003] .....	17
<i>Personius v. Mann</i> , 20 AD3d 616, 617, 798 N.Y.S.2d 195 [3d Dept], aff'd as mod 5 NY3d 857, 840 N.E.2d 1024, 807 N.Y.S.2d 11 [2005] .....	7
<i>Porazzo v. City of New York</i> , 39 AD3d 731, 834 NYS2d 298 [2007]) .....	12
<i>Reyes v. Morton Williams Associated Supermarkets, Inc.</i> , 50 A.D.3d 496, 858 N.Y.S.2d 107 [1st Dept. 2008] .....	18
<i>Roberts v. Worth Constr., Inc.</i> , 21 AD3d 1074 [2d Dept 2005] .....	12
<i>Rocovich v. Consolidated Edison Co.</i> , 78 NY2d 509, 513, 583 NE2d 932, 577 NYS2d 219 [1991] .....	3

# 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.