

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>

Recommended Citation

St. John's Law Review (1971) "The Quarterly Survey of New York Practice Table of Contents," *St. John's Law Review*: Vol. 45 : No. 3 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol45/iss3/7>

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 lasalar@stjohns.edu.

NOTICE

Due to the lateness of this issue, and in order to maintain the *Survey's* position as a work of current import, the March and the May installments of this section have been combined and are contained herein.

III

THE QUARTERLY SURVEY OF NEW YORK PRACTICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE 2 — LIMITATIONS OF TIME

<i>CPLR 203(e): Wrongful death claim deemed not to relate back to cause of action for personal injuries</i>	502
<i>CPLR 203(e): Notice requirement of section is not satisfied when movant seeks to change the status in which party is sued</i>	504
<i>CPLR 205(a): Dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction does not bar commencement of second action where defendant has been properly served</i>	505
<i>CPLR 208: Surviving spouse is one "entitled to commence an action" even though incapacity prevents her appointment</i>	506
<i>CPLR 214(6): Second Department extends Flanagan rule of discovery in foreign-object medical malpractice cases</i>	507

ARTICLE 3 — JURISDICTION AND SERVICE, APPEARANCE AND CHOICE OF COURT

<i>CPLR 302(a)(3)(ii): Case illustrates factors to be considered when determining whether a defendant has derived "substantial revenue from interstate or international commerce"</i>	509
<i>CPLR 308(1): Service on attorney in defendant's presence deemed valid</i>	511
<i>CPLR 320: The appearing nonresident — Everitt revisited</i>	512

ARTICLE 10 — PARTIES GENERALLY

<i>CPLR 1005: Use of class action continues to be restricted by the courts</i>	515
<i>CPLR 1007: Case illustrates Mendel's effect on third-party claims</i>	517

ARTICLE 30 — REMEDIES AND PLEADINGS

<i>CPLR 3025(b): Practice of granting leave to amend pleadings without inquiry into the merits of the cause of action as amended ruled no longer tolerable</i>	518
---	-----

ARTICLE 31 — DISCLOSURE

<i>CPLR 3101: Court recognizes that public policy grounds for restricting disclosure in matrimonial actions are no longer viable</i>	519
<i>CPLR 3101(a)(4): Satisfaction of section 17 of Court of Claims Act automatically satisfies "special circumstances" requirement</i>	520

ARTICLE 32 — ACCELERATED JUDGMENT

<i>Collateral Estoppel: Prior judgment establishing freedom from negligence does not ipso facto establish freedom from contributory negligence in second action</i>	521
<i>CPLR 3213: Surety's labor and material bond deemed not to constitute an instrument for the payment of money only</i>	522

ARTICLE 52 — ENFORCEMENT OF MONEY JUDGMENTS

<i>CPLR 5208: Sheriff is permitted to sell real property after judgment debtor's death provided that execution was issued before death</i>	523
--	-----

CPLR 5222: Section does not mandate the red-carpet treatment of judgment creditors 524
CPLR 5231(h): Section does not apply to two different employers 525

ARTICLE 75 — ARBITRATION

CPLR 7502(b): Court refers time-limitations objection to arbitration 526
CPLR 7503(c): Nonsignatory of arbitration agreement is not precluded by the failure to apply for a stay of arbitration within ten days 528
CPLR 7503(c): Application to stay arbitration must be received within ten days 530

NEW YORK CITY CIVIL COURT ACT

CCA 404: Execution within New York City of contract to send child to summer camp is not a transaction of business 531

UNIFORM DISTRICT COURT ACT

UDCA 206: District Court's power to confirm an arbitrator's award is determined by amount of the award and not by the amount of the original claim 534

UNIFORM JUSTICE COURT ACT

UJCA 208: Appellate Court prevents inadvertent waiver of amount in counter-claim exceeding \$1,000 535

*Introduction**

Certain procedural provisions generate problems which consistently elude resolution due to either the absence of appellate guidance or the presence of factual situations which are sui generis. Illustrative of this phenomenon are the following issues presented in cases discussed herein: when has a defendant transacted "business" under CPLR 302(a)(1) or CCA 404; what constitutes "substantial revenue" under

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

New York Civil Practice Law and RulesCPLR
 New York Civil Practice ActCPA
 New York Rules of Civil PracticeRCP
 New York City Civil Court ActCCA
 Uniform District Court ActUDCA
 Uniform Justice Court ActUJCA
 Uniform City Court ActUCCA
 Real Property Actions and Proceedings LawRPAPL
 Domestic Relations LawDRL

WEINSTEIN, KORN & MILLER, NEW YORK CIVIL PRACTICE (1969)WK&M
The Biannual Survey of New York Practice *The Biannual Survey*
The Quarterly Survey of New York Practice *The Quarterly Survey*

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. 13SECOND REP.
 1959 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 17THIRD REP.
 1960 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 80FOURTH REP.
 1961 FINAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 ON PRACTICE AND PROCEDUREFINAL REP.

Also valuable are the two joint reports of the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees:

1961 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 15FIFTH REP.
 1962 N.Y. LEG. DOC. NO. 8SIXTH REP.

CPLR 302(a)(3)(ii); what instruments qualify for expeditious treatment under CPLR 3213; and, when is the last day on which an application to stay arbitration may be received by a party demanding arbitration?

Additionally, a number of recent decisions have created uncertainty in areas which appeared to be settled. Particularly important are the cases dealing with the relation back doctrine of CPLR 203(e), the definition of timely commencement under CPLR 205(a), and the personal delivery requirement of CPLR 308(1).

Lastly, special mention should be made of *Murphy v. St. Charles Hospital* and *In re Einstoss* which are discussed under CPLR sections 214(6) and 320 respectively. In *Murphy* the Second Department moved one step closer to a rule of discovery in medical malpractice cases. In *Einstoss* the Court of Appeals broadened the concept of a limited appearance and opened the door for a reevaluation of the liability of a nonresident defendant vis-à-vis his codefendants and the original plaintiff.

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.

ARTICLE 2—LIMITATIONS OF TIME

CPLR 203(e): Wrongful death claim deemed not to relate back to cause of action for personal injuries.

To overcome the harsh effects of *Harriss v. Tams*,¹ the Advisory Committee² recommended passage of CPLR 203(e). This section provides that a claim asserted in an amended pleading relates back, for

¹ 258 N.Y. 229, 179 N.E. 476 (1932) (statute of limitations is tolled only as to those claims originally inserted).

² See SECOND REP. 50-51. In drafting the CPLR, the Advisory Committee intended to afford the courts the "widest possible discretion" when ruling on motions to amend or supplement pleadings. FIRST REP. 78. In fact, both CPLR 203(e) and CPLR 3025(b) were designed to permit even greater freedom than the federal rule, FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a), (c), after which they were patterned. See 1 WK&M ¶ 203.30.