

CPLR 3402: Alleged Conflict Between Court Rules and the CPLR

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.

complied with on all motions, even those based on general delay.²²⁷ This issue has not been passed upon by either the third or fourth department and will undoubtedly require further resolution by the Court of Appeals.²²⁸

ARTICLE 34 — CALENDAR PRACTICE; TRIAL PREFERENCES

CPLR 3402: Alleged conflict between court rules and the CPLR.

In *Bedingfield v. Dairymaid Farms, Inc.*,²²⁹ the court declared plaintiff's note of issue, filed without a statement of readiness, premature under the applicable rules of the appellate division, second department.²³⁰ Plaintiff contended that this conclusion was in conflict with CPLR 3402 which allows the filing of the note of issue forty days after the completion of the service of summons since the CPLR does not specifically mention the requirement of a statement of readiness. The court ruled that the CPLR authorizes the adoption of rules pertaining to calendar practice. In holding that the CPLR is "consistent with the inherent power of the court to control its business,"²³¹ the case confirms the view that unless the practitioner can point to an unambiguous clash between court rule and CPLR provision, the rule is not likely to be upset.

ARTICLE 41 — TRIAL BY A JURY

*CPLR 4103: Liberally construed.*²³²

In *Vinlis Constr. Corp. v. Roreck*,²³³ the plaintiff originally sought an accounting and thereafter amended his complaint to include an action for money damages. Since a new note of issue was not filed, the defendant was precluded from exercising the statutory

²²⁷ The approach taken by the second department can be traced in *McLoughlin v. Weiss*, 23 App. Div. 2d 881, 259 N.Y.S.2d 941 (2d Dep't 1965); *Gilligan v. Farmers Co-op. Marketing Assoc.*, 23 App. Div. 2d 850, 259 N.Y.S.2d 219 (2d Dep't 1965); *Tex Mode Inc. v. Dogmar Bag, Inc.*, 23 App. Div. 2d 652, 257 N.Y.S.2d 516 (2d Dep't 1965); *Devita v. Metropolitan Dist. Inc.*, 45 Misc. 2d 761, 257 N.Y.S.2d 618 (Sup. Ct. Nassau County 1965); *Kalning v. New York Cent. R.R.*, 45 Misc. 2d 1036, 258 N.Y.S.2d 743 (Sup. Ct. Queens County 1965).

²²⁸ For a more thorough treatment of the repercussions of the 1964 amendment, see 7B MCKINNEY'S CPLR 3216, supp. commentary 160 (1965).

²²⁹ 46 Misc. 2d 146, 259 N.Y.S.2d 292 (Sup. Ct. Suffolk County 1965).

²³⁰ N.Y. App. Div. R. 1(a), pt. 7 (2d Dep't 1964).

²³¹ *Bedingfield v. Dairymaid Farms, Inc.*, 46 Misc. 2d 146, 147, 259 N.Y.S.2d 292, 294 (Sup. Ct. Suffolk County 1965).

²³² Under CPLR 4103, if it appears during the trial of an action that the adverse party is entitled to a jury trial on any legal question, then the court shall give that party an opportunity to demand a jury.

²³³ 23 App. Div. 2d 895, 260 N.Y.S.2d 245 (2d Dep't 1965).