Lardiere v Site 6 DSA Owner LLC

2024 NY Slip Op 34026(U)

November 13, 2024

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: Index No. 153260/2018

Judge: Arlene P. Bluth

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.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1010

INDEX NO. 153260/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/13/2024

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: HON. ARLENE P. BLUTH	PART	14
Justice		
X	INDEX NO.	153260/2018
ROSARIO LARDIERE,	MOTION DATE	11/12/2024
Plaintiff,	MOTION SEQ. NO.	013 015
SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC, SITE 6 COMMERCIAL LLC, TACONIC INVESTMENT PARTNERS, L&M DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, BFC PARTNERS, L.P, DELANCEY STREET ASSOCIATES LLC, NYU LANGONE HEALTH SYSTEM, HUNTER-ROBERTS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC, BFC PHASE 1 DSA LLC, THE PACE COMPANIES NEW YORK, INC., PEEPELS MECHANICAL CORP., Defendant.	DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION Third-Party Index No. 595818/2018	
Plaintiff, -against-		
GIL-BAR INDUSTRIES, THE PACE COMPANIES NEW YORK INC., PEEPELS MECHANICAL CORP		
Defendant. SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC, SITE 6 COMMERCIAL LLC, TACONIC INVESTMENT PARTNERS, L&M DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, DELANCEY STREET ASSOCIATES LLC, NYU LANGONE HEALTH SYSTEM, HUNTER-ROBERTS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC, BFC PHASE 1 DSA LLC Plaintiff, -against- SITE SAFETY,LLC, MECHANICAL PIPING SOLUTIONS	Second Th Index No. 59	
153260/2018 LARDIERE, ROSARIO vs. SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC		Page 1 of 4

Motion No. 013 015

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1010

INDEX NO. 153260/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/13/2024

Defendant.	
SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC, SITE 6 COMMERCIAL LLC, TACONIC INVESTMENT PARTNERS, L&M DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, DELANCEY STREET ASSOCIATES LLC, NYU LANGONE HEALTH SYSTEM, HUNTER-ROBERTS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC, BFC PHASE 1 DSA LLC	Third Third-Party Index No. 596072/2021
Plaintiff,	
-against-	
COMMODORE CONSTRUCTION CORP.	
Defendant.	
PEEPELS MECHANICAL CORP	Fourth Third-Party
Plaintiff,	Index No. 595014/2024
-against-	
COMMODORE CONSTRUCTION CORP., MECHANICAL PIPING SOLUTIONS INC.	
Defendant.	
The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu 1000, 1003, 1006, 1007, 1008	ımber (Motion 013) 975, 976, 977, 999
were read on this motion to/for	REARGUE .
The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document nu 982, 1001, 1004, 1005	ımber (Motion 015) 978, 979, 980, 981
were read on this motion to/for	REARGUE .
Motion Sequence Numbers 013 and 015 are consolic	lated for disposition. Defendant The

Pace Companies New York Inc. ("Pace")'s motion (MS013) to reargue and third-party defendant Gil-Bar Industries ("Gil-Bar")'s motion (MS015) to reargue are granted and, upon rearguement, the Court modifies its prior decision as described below.

153260/2018 LARDIERE, ROSARIO vs. SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC Motion No. 013 015

Page 2 of 4

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 11/14/2024 12:22 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1010

INDEX NO. 153260/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/13/2024

Background

In this Labor Law action, plaintiff claims he was hit in the head by a pipe while visiting a construction site. This Court previously found, in connection with a prior decision on multiple summary judgment motions, that plaintiff was not entitled to protection under Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6) because he was not actively engaged in any construction activities at the time of his accident (NYSCEF Doc. No. 959). Plaintiff was a commissioned salesperson who sold HVAC units for Gil-Bar and was at the construction site that day merely to take a look at the HVAC unit; he was not there to do any construction work.

Both Pace and Gil-Bar now move to reargue. Pace, the entity that installed the sprinkler, contends that the Court should find that plaintiff is not entitled to protection under Labor Law § 200. Gil-Bar makes similar arguments.

Discussion

The Court grants rearguement, and upon rearguement, the Court now dismisses the Labor Law § 200 claim. The Court's prior determination with respect to Labor Law § 200 was based on the text of the statute, which provides that "All places to which this chapter applies shall be so constructed, equipped, arranged, operated and conducted as to provide reasonable and adequate protection to the lives, health and safety of all persons employed therein or lawfully frequenting such places" (Labor Law § 200[1]). The Court viewed plaintiff as an individual who was "lawfully frequenting" the area under instructions from his employer. However, the Court observes that this phrase, "lawfully frequenting" has been interpreted narrowly (*Mordkofsky v V.C.V. Dev. Corp.*, 76 NY2d 573, 577, 561 NYS2d 892 [1990] [observing that Labor Law § 200 was designed to protect workers and declining to extend its protection to a contract-vendee]).

153260/2018 LARDIERE, ROSARIO vs. SITE 6 DSA OWNER LLC Motion No. 013 015

Page 3 of 4

* 31

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 1010

INDEX NO. 153260/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/13/2024

More recently, the Appellate Division, First Department held that an employee of nonparty moving company hired to move a large computer server rack was not entitled to the protections of the Labor Law, including section 200, because he was not hired to do construction work nor was his task "necessary and incidental" to the construction work (Minholz v Columbia Univ., 222 AD3d 595, 596, 204 NYS3d 468 [1st Dept 2023]). This case law compels the Court to find that plaintiff is not entitled to assert a Labor Law § 200 claim.

However, plaintiff's common law negligence claim remains for the reasons the Court articulated in the prior decision (NYSCEF Doc. No. 959 at 19-21). The Court cannot embrace Pace's view of the facts on a motion for summary judgment. Moreover, plaintiff and defendant Peepels Mechanical Corp. identified issues of fact concerning Pace's presence on the job site and the exact reason for why the pipe fell.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motions (MS013 and MS015) to reargue are granted and, upon rearguement, the Court dismisses plaintiff's Labor Law § 200 claim but otherwise adheres to its prior decision.

11/13/2024						CABO		<i>)</i>
DATE	_					ARLENE P. BLU	ΓH, J	.S.C.
CHECK ONE:		CASE DISPOSED			Х	NON-FINAL DISPOSITION		
		GRANTED		DENIED	Х	GRANTED IN PART		OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER		•		SUBMIT ORDER		_
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		INCLUDES TRANSFE	R/RI	EASSIGN		FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT		REFERENCE