

The Quarterly Survey of New York Practice Table of Contents

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.

THE QUARTERLY SURVEY OF NEW YORK PRACTICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE 3 — JURISDICTION AND SERVICE, APPEARANCE AND CHOICE OF COURT	
<i>CPLR 302(a)(1): Further construction of the words "in person," "through an agent," and "transacts business"</i>	156
<i>CPLR 302(a)(4): Jurisdiction predicated upon ownership of property before cause of action accrued</i>	159
<i>CPLR 303: Agent for service of process relationship exists only as long as the action is pending</i>	160
ARTICLE 6 — JOINDER OF CLAIMS, CONSOLIDATION AND SEVERANCE	
<i>CPLR 602: Court permits consolidation of tripartite arbitrations</i>	161
ARTICLE 10 — PARTIES GENERALLY	
<i>CPLR 1007: Impleader allowed despite allegations of active negligence in complaint where bill of particulars indicates that defendant was only passively negligent</i>	161
ARTICLE 30 — REMEDIES AND PLEADING	
<i>CPLR 3024(b): Paragraph inserted in complaint in anticipation of statute of limitations defense held prejudicial</i>	163
<i>CPLR 3025(b)&(c): Cases illustrate disagreement over whether to grant a motion to amend ad damnum clause</i>	164
<i>CPLR 3042: Court vacates preclusion order upon condition that delinquent party pay \$100 costs</i>	166
ARTICLE 31 — DISCLOSURE	
<i>CPLR 3101(a): Income tax returns deemed "material and necessary"</i>	167
<i>CPLR 3126: Penalty imposed on attorney for failure to disclose</i>	168
ARTICLE 32 — ACCELERATED JUDGMENT	
<i>CPLR 3211(c): Conflict over propriety of pre-joinder motion for summary judgment</i>	168
<i>CPLR 3213: Support clause in separation agreement considered an instrument for the payment of money</i>	169
<i>CPLR 3216: Service of forty-five day demand by ordinary mail permitted where no prejudice is shown</i>	171
ARTICLE 50 — JUDGMENTS GENERALLY	
<i>CPLR 5004: Conflict over legal rate of interest continues</i>	172
<i>CPLR 5015: Default judgments vacated sua sponte</i>	174
ARTICLE 52 — ENFORCEMENT OF MONEY JUDGMENTS	
<i>CPLR 5226: Public welfare recipient not exempt from installment payment order</i>	175
ARTICLE 62 — ATTACHMENT	
<i>CPLR 6214(a): Designation of agent for service of process made pursuant to section 59 of Insurance Law held insufficient for service of attachment levy</i>	176
<i>CPLR 6214(e): Time extension after expiration of ninety-day period granted subject to the rights of intervening lienors</i>	177
ARTICLE 65 — NOTICE OF PENDENCY	
<i>CPLR 6511(b): Absolute conformity with statutory content provisions not required</i>	178
ARTICLE 71 — RECOVERY OF CHATTEL	
<i>CPLR 7102: Court upholds constitutionality of replevin provision</i>	179
ARTICLE 75 — ARBITRATION	
<i>CPLR 7503(a): Error to condition order granting motion to compel arbitration upon movant's prompt commencement of arbitral proceedings</i>	181

<i>CPLR 7503(a): Service of an application to compel arbitration upon an attorney by mail is proper if an action is already pending</i>	182
<i>CPLR 7503(c): Ten-day statute of limitations is satisfied by posting papers by certified mail on tenth day after receipt of a notice of intention to arbitrate</i>	182
<i>CPLR 7511(b)(1)(iii): Court of Appeals establishes criteria for determining whether arbitrator has exceeded his powers</i>	184
<i>CPLR 7511(c): Case illustrates practicality of modification order</i>	186
ARTICLE 78 — PROCEEDING AGAINST BODY OR OFFICER	
<i>CPLR 7804(c): Notice of petition must be served at least twenty days before hearing date</i>	186
ARTICLE 81 — COSTS GENERALLY	
<i>CPLR 8102: Discretion exercised in allowing costs in county court action</i>	187

*Introduction**

The reader who is seeking refuge from the monetary pressures of the times is afforded little sanctuary in this issue of the *Survey*. For, reported under articles 30, 31, 32, 50, 52 and 81 are decisions dealing with amending the ad damnum clause of a complaint, imposing penalties upon a party and an attorney, utilizing a separation agreement as the basis for a 3213 motion for summary judgment, examining conflicting views over the legal rate of interest, reaching a welfare recipient's hidden source of income and allowing costs in a county court action despite statutory mandate, respectively. Obviously, these cases carry financial implications for an attorney as well as his client.

* The following abbreviations will be used uniformly throughout the *Survey*:

New York Civil Practice Law and Rules	CPLR
New York Civil Practice Act	CPA
New York Rules of Civil Practice	RCP
New York City Civil Court Act	CCA
Uniform District Court Act	UDCA
Uniform City Court Act	UCCA
Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law	RPAPL
Domestic Relations Law	DRL
WEINSTEIN, KORN & MILLER, NEW YORK CIVIL PRACTICE (1969)	WK&M
<i>The Biannual Survey of New York Practice</i>	<i>The Biannual Survey</i>
<i>The Quarterly Survey of New York Practice</i>	<i>The Quarterly Survey</i>
Extremely valuable in understanding the CPLR are the five reports of the Advisory Committee on Practice and Procedure. They are contained in the following legislative documents and will be cited as follows.	
1957 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 6(b)	FIRST REP.
1958 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 13	SECOND REP.
1959 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 17	THIRD REP.
1960 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 80	FOURTH REP.
1961 FINAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE	FINAL REP.
Also valuable are the two joint reports of the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees:	
1961 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 15	FIFTH REP.
1962 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 8	SIXTH REP.

Among the more significant cases discussed herein are two Court of Appeals decisions: *Parke-Bernet v. Franklyn* and *Granite Worsted Mills v. Aaronson Cowen, Ltd.* The former apparently marks the end of judicial entanglement with technical rules of agency when jurisdiction is predicated under the long-arm statute. The latter seemingly heralds the beginning of speculative scrutiny of an arbitrator's award.

Finally, special attention must be given to the arguments advanced in *Lawson v. Mantell*, which is reported under article 71. There, the replevin provision contained in CPLR 7102 withstood constitutional attack in the face of allegations that it violated the due process and equal protection clauses. Nevertheless, immediately prior to publication, a federal court held that the section is violative of due process requirements. Further analysis of this area can be expected in future issues of the *Survey*.

The *Survey* sets forth in each installment those cases which are deemed to make the most significant contribution to New York's procedural law. Due to limitations of space, however, many other less important, but, nevertheless, significant cases cannot be included. While few cases are exhaustively discussed, it is hoped that the *Survey* accomplishes its basic purpose, viz., to key the practitioner to significant developments in the procedural law of New York.

The Table of Contents is designed to direct the reader to those specific areas of procedural law which may be of importance to him. The various sections of the CPLR which are specifically treated in the cases are listed under their respective titles.

CPLR 302(a)(1): Further construction of the words "in person," "through an agent," and "transacts business."

Almost since its inception, the purpose of CPLR 302(a)(1)¹ has been, in the words of the Court of Appeals, "to take advantage of the 'new [jurisdictional] enclave' . . . opened up by *International Shoe* where the nonresident defendant has engaged in some purposeful activities in the state."² Nevertheless, in enacting this section, the legislature chose not to fix precise standards as to the minimal contacts required to sustain jurisdiction.³ Two recent cases, in an attempt to clarify the factual prerequisites to the assertion of long-

¹ CPLR 302(a)(1) confers personal jurisdiction over any nondomiciliary who in person or through an agent "transacts any business within the state."

² *Longines-Wittnauer Watch Co. v. Barnes & Reinecke, Inc.*, 15 N.Y.2d 443, 456-57, 209 N.E.2d 68, 75, 261 N.Y.S.2d 8, 18 (1964).

³ *Id.* at 456, 209 N.E.2d at 75, 261 N.Y.S.2d at 18.