

Signing and Correcting Deposition

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.

difficult to perceive why abuses would occur more readily in negligence or wrongful death actions than in any other actions.¹⁹⁷

It should be indicated that the principal case involved a malpractice action against a doctor, rather than an attorney. A malpractice suit against either one skilled in the science of medicine¹⁹⁸ or one proficient in the practice of law¹⁹⁹ is based upon a failure to exercise the skill requisite to his profession and is, therefore, tortious in nature. But the difference between these two malpractice categories (medicine as against law) lies in the basis of damages. In an action against a doctor the damages recoverable are for personal injuries;²⁰⁰ against an attorney the basis of damages is the amount the plaintiff would have recovered had the action not been negligently handled.²⁰¹ Consequently, it appears that interrogatories would be permissible in a malpractice action against an attorney but not in one brought against a doctor.

Whereas interrogatories may be used in numerous actions,²⁰² it appears they will be used primarily in commercial cases, and transactions, especially those involving corporations.²⁰³ Where statistical matter or detailed lists of sales or lists of articles manufactured are needed, it is more appropriate to obtain these through interrogatories, to which answers may be compiled at the answerer's leisure rather than through a deposition which is taken at a single sitting.²⁰⁴

Signing and Correcting the Deposition

In *Marine Trust Co. v. Collins*,²⁰⁵ a witness, following his pretrial examination, undertook to make corrections in his deposition before signing it. He assigned as his reasons that the corrections were made "to give an accurate statement thereof and to correct

¹⁹⁷ 3 WEINSTEIN, KORN & MILLER, NEW YORK CIVIL PRACTICE ¶ 3130.02 (1963).

¹⁹⁸ *Colvin v. Smith*, 276 App. Div. 9, 92 N.Y.S.2d 794 (3d Dep't 1949).

¹⁹⁹ *Strauss v. New Amsterdam Cas. Co.*, 30 Misc. 2d 345, 347, 216 N.Y.S.2d 861, 864 (N.Y. Munic. Ct. 1961).

²⁰⁰ *Colvin v. Smith*, *supra* note 198.

²⁰¹ See Wade, *The Attorney's Liability For Negligence*, 12 VAND. L. REV. 755, 772 (1959).

²⁰² Interrogatories might, perhaps, be used in defamation actions where the basis of damages is injury to reputation. See PROSSER, TORTS 574 (2d ed. 1955); SEELMAN, LAW OF LIBEL AND SLANDER IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK 1 (1933); SPRING, RISKS AND RIGHTS IN PUBLISHING, TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, ADVERTISING AND THE THEATER 41 (2d ed. 1956).

²⁰³ 3 WEINSTEIN, KORN & MILLER, NEW YORK CIVIL PRACTICE ¶ 3130.05, at 31-246 (1963).

²⁰⁴ *Id.* at 31-247.

²⁰⁵ 19 App. Div. 2d 857, 243 N.Y.S.2d 993 (4th Dep't 1963).

errors by the reporter in the transcription of my [the witness'] testimony." The court held that while it is permissible for a witness to make changes on a deposition before signing it, he must give "the reason therefor—either that it is an incorrect transcript or that his present recollection of the facts is more accurate—and he may then state what his corrected answer is and give any other explanation he desires with respect to his prior answer."

It has been the established procedure to permit a witness to make any changes in a deposition before signing it.²⁰⁶ However, an omnibus statement as to the reason for correction will not be sufficient under the CPLR, whatever its acceptance was under the CPA. Rather, the transcript of the testimony should indicate what the original testimony was, what the corrected testimony is, and finally, whether the corrections are due to a challenge to the stenographer's accuracy or a desire on the part of the witness to change his testimony. There is prior case law to just that effect.²⁰⁷ The reason for this requirement of specificity is obvious—if the accuracy of the stenographer is challenged, the party taking the deposition will put the stenographer on the witness stand to testify that he took the statement accurately²⁰⁸ and thereby raise a question of credibility. In addition, this procedure will enable the trial court to compare the original form of the answer with the corrected answer to determine which one should be credited.²⁰⁹

ACCELERATED JUDGMENT

Objection to Jurisdiction Raised in the Answer—Getting an Early Disposition

In *Kukoda v. Schneider*,²¹⁰ a personal injury action, defendant objected to the court's jurisdiction by way of an affirmative defense in his answer, a CPLR procedure unknown to the CPA. Plaintiff then moved to dismiss the affirmative defense on the ground that no defense was stated.²¹¹ The court held that although the

²⁰⁶ *E.g.*, *Skeaney v. Silver Beach Realty Corp.*, 10 App. Div. 2d 537, 201 N.Y.S.2d 163 (1st Dep't 1960); *Columbia v. Lee*, 239 App. Div. 849, 264 N.Y. Supp. 423 (2d Dep't 1933); *Gottfried v. Gottfried*, 197 Misc. 562, 95 N.Y.S.2d 561 (Sup. Ct. 1950); *Hayes v. City of N.Y.*, 98 N.Y.S.2d 424 (Sup. Ct. 1950); *American Worcestershire Sauce Co. v. Armour & Co.*, 194 Misc. 745, 87 N.Y.S.2d 738 (Sup. Ct. 1949).

²⁰⁷ *Mansbach v. Klausner*, 179 Misc. 952, 40 N.Y.S.2d 647 (Sup. Ct. 1943).

²⁰⁸ *Id.* at 953, 40 N.Y.S.2d at 648.

²⁰⁹ *Columbia v. Lee*, *supra* note 206, at 850, 264 N.Y. Supp. at 424.

²¹⁰ 41 Misc. 2d 308, 245 N.Y.S.2d 271 (Sup. Ct. 1963).

²¹¹ CPLR R. 3211(b).