CPLR 3121: Doctor-Patient Privilege Is Waived If Party's Physical Condition Is in Controversy
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contrary result would have been unjust and would have contravened both the express purpose of CPLR 104 and the general rule that a party may not benefit from his own misconduct. Had the party-deponent been too ill to attend trial or had he died prior to the trial, his deposition could of course have been accepted as evidence.

The Jobse rationale therefore suggests that the “absence of the witness due to a party’s wrongdoing” principle in CPLR 3117(a)(3)(ii) is applicable to all the provisions in CPLR 3117(a)(3) which permit the use of depositions. That is, depositions of an absent witness will not be admissible by a party who has purposefully created the conditions causing his absence.

CPLR 3121: Doctor-patient privilege is waived if party’s physical condition is in controversy.

Ordinarily, when a plaintiff seeks to recover damages for personal injuries, he waives the doctor-patient privilege and is required to disclose medical information under CPLR 3121. Similarly, a defendant who counterclaims for personal injuries or who affirmatively defends on the basis of his physical condition must disclose pertinent medical materials. For example, in Fisher v. Fossett, the defendant waived the doctor-patient privilege when she stated in both a report and an examination before trial that she had blacked out at the wheel of her car because of a coronary condition.

The doctor-patient privilege and disclosure under CPLR 3121 were recently examined by the appellate division in Koump v. Smith. In Koump, the plaintiff was injured when the defendant drove across a highway divider and crashed head-on into the plaintiff’s car. The complaint alleged that at the time of the accident the defendant was intoxicated and this circumstance caused the collision; the answer denied these allegations. Pursuant to CPLR 3121, the plaintiff served
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notice for disclosure of the defendant’s hospital records relating to his physical condition following the accident.

The appellate division held that the party seeking disclosure must produce more than a mere showing that the opposing party’s physical condition has been placed in controversy as provided in CPLR 3121(a). The party must further show that his opponent has waived his right to object to the disclosure of privileged matter under CPLR 3101(b) or that the information sought is not privileged. Since neither waiver nor non-privilege were shown, the court refused to consider whether the defendant’s condition had been placed in controversy.

The New York Court of Appeals affirmed this decision on different grounds. As to the existence of the doctor-patient privilege, it was held that the burden of proof is on the party claiming the privilege. Furthermore, Judge Scileppi stated that the party seeking disclosure may assert a waiver of the privilege merely by showing that the opponent’s physical or mental condition is in controversy. With regard to the facts of the instant case, the Court stated that the defendant’s physical condition may have been put in controversy if one of the following tests had been met:

[H]e affirmatively asserted it in a pleading or at an examination before trial or because he had undergone a prior physical examination which substantiated or gave credence to the allegations of the plaintiff’s complaint.

Thus, the defendant’s physical condition was not in controversy in this case, and the hospital records were not subject to disclosure since he had merely denied plaintiff’s allegations regarding his intoxication.

Prior to the Court’s decision, there was some confusion as to the relationship between the doctor-patient privilege, the protection of privileged matter under CPLR 3101(b), and the right to disclosure of medical information under CPLR 3121. The key to this relationship has always been whether a party’s physical condition is in controversy; if it is, the doctor-patient privilege is waived and the privilege afforded
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by CPLR 3101(b) will not be available. Full disclosure will then be ordered pursuant to CPLR 3121. The Court's decision in *Koump* provides the practitioner with appellate guidelines he can utilize in seeking to determine whether or not his client's physical condition has been placed in controversy.

**CPLR 3121: Second department puts bar on notice that it will strictly enforce rule governing notice of availability for physical examination.**

In *Delgado v. Fogle* the rights and obligations of parties under rule I of part 5 of the Rules of the Appellate Division, Second Department were clearly delineated. In *Delgado*, which involved an action for personal injuries, the plaintiff served notice of availability for a physical examination on the defendant who neglected to appear at the specified time. Nevertheless, the trial court granted the defendant's subsequent motion to direct the plaintiff to appear for an examination.

In a strongly worded opinion, the court stated that the rule places an affirmative duty on the party served to proceed with the physical examination or to move to vacate the notice. If neither alternative is followed, the right to conduct the examination will be waived unless the defaulting party can demonstrate a reasonable excuse for its failure to appear. However, the court affirmed the trial court's liberal holding because the rule was being construed for the first time. Judge Martuscello, however, issued a strong warning to the bar, noting that the rule would be *strictly* enforced in the future.

**CPLR 3121: Medical report not based on physical or clinical examination is not subject to disclosure.**

In *Edelman v. Homes Private Ambulances, Inc.*, an action to recover damages for personal injuries, the plaintiff sought to preclude the use of the defendant's medical report because a copy of the report was not served on the plaintiff thirty days prior to trial pursuant to his request. The court, however, held that the report was based solely upon hospital records, and not upon a physical or clinical examination of the plaintiff. Therefore, it was not available to the plaintiff as part
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