

CPLR 7501: Right to Jury Trial on Issue of Existence of Arbitration Agreement

St. John's Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview>

This Recent Development in New York Law is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in St. John's Law Review by an authorized editor of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact selbyc@stjohns.edu.

CPLR 7501: Right to jury trial on issue of existence of arbitration agreement.

The right to a jury trial on the issue of the existence of an agreement to arbitrate was explicitly recognized under CPA 1450 and 1458(2). Under the CPLR, there is no such provision for a jury trial, but the accepted view is that this omission did not evidence a legislative intent "to eliminate trial by jury if it is desirable or constitutionally required."¹⁸⁸ In *RLC Electronics, Inc. v. American Electronics Laboratories, Inc.*,¹⁸⁹ the Appellate Division, Second Department, reversed an order of the Supreme Court, Westchester County, and held that the appellant was entitled to a jury trial on the issue of the existence of an arbitration agreement.

CPLR 7503: First Department recommends time limitation for proceeding with arbitration.

*Glen Creations, Inc. v. Cotra Corp.*¹⁹⁰ highlighted a serious deficiency in CPLR 7503. In March, 1969, the Supreme Court, New York County, vacated a temporary stay of arbitration. For more than three years the respondent failed to initiate arbitration while the decision was being appealed. The Appellate Division, First Department, reversed and granted a stay, finding no evidence of an agreement to arbitrate. Importantly, both the majority and the dissent recommended that the Law Revision Commission propose that "an arbitration . . . be begun within such reasonable time as fixed by the Legislature from the date of notice of arbitration, or, where the right to arbitrate has been contested, the entry of the order denying a stay."¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ SECOND REP. 135-36. See *Anthony Drugs of Bethpage, Inc. v. Drug & Hosp. Local 1199*, 34 App. Div. 2d 788, 311 N.Y.S.2d 622 (2d Dep't 1970) (mem.); *MVAIC v. Stein*, 23 App. Div. 2d 526, 527, 255 N.Y.S.2d 483, 486 (4th Dep't 1965) (mem.); 7B MCKINNEY'S CPLR 7503, commentary at 488 (1963); 4 WK&M ¶ 4101.28; 22 CARMODY-WAIT 2d, § 141:74, at 829 (1968).

¹⁸⁹ 39 App. Div. 2d 757, 332 N.Y.S.2d 119 (2d Dep't 1972) (mem.). *Accord*, *Anthony Drugs of Bethpage, Inc. v. Drug & Hosp. Local 1199*, 34 App. Div. 2d 788, 311 N.Y.S.2d 622 (2d Dep't 1970) (mem.).

¹⁹⁰ 39 App. Div. 2d 866, 333 N.Y.S.2d 232 (1st Dep't 1972) (mem.) (3-2).

¹⁹¹ *Id.* at 867, 333 N.Y.S.2d at 234 (Steuer, J., dissenting). In the absence of a time limitation for arbitration, courts have sought to achieve equitable results by applying the doctrines of voluntary abandonment, waiver, and laches. See, e.g., *Zimmerman v. Cohen*, 236 N.Y. 15, 139 N.E. 764 (1923) (answer setting up a defense and counterclaim held to be a waiver of the right to arbitration and an election to proceed by court action); *Finkelstein v. Harris*, 17 App. Div. 2d 137, 233 N.Y.S.2d 174 (1st Dep't 1962) (six-year failure to proceed deemed an abandonment); *Buchanan v. Rogers*, 9 App. Div. 2d 1010, 194 N.Y.S.2d 741 (3d Dep't 1959) (mem.) (bringing legal action constituted waiver of right to arbitration, and, furthermore, laches arising from inordinate delay barred enforcement of that right); *Schussel v. Schussel*, 63 N.Y.S.2d 380 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. County