NYSCEF DOC. NO. 15

## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT:	HON. DEBRA A. JAMES		PART I	IAS MOTION 59EFM	
		Justice			
		X	INDEX NO.	153010/2019	
	TER OF THE APPLICATION OF SURANCE COMPANY OF AME		MOTION DATE	8/30/2019	
	Petitioner,		MOTION SEQ. NO	001	
- v - KATRINA ORTIZ,			DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION		
	Respondent.				
		X			
The following e	e-filed documents, listed by NYS	CEF document num	nber (Motion 001) 2	2, 11, 12, 13	
were read on t	his motion to/for		STAY .		
		ORDER			

Upon the foregoing documents, it is hereby

ADJUDGED that the petition to permanently stay the subject uninsured motorist benefits arbitration is granted in all respects, without costs and disbursements to petitioner; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk shall enter judgment, accordingly.

## DECISION

CPLR § 7503(a)(i) provides that "proceedings to stay or bar arbitration shall be brought in the county where the party seeking arbitration resides or is doing business." As respondent resides in Kings County, such county is the proper place of venue. However, pursuant to CPLR 511(a), respondent's remedy was to serve a demand for a change of venue before or

153010/2019 NATIONWIDE AFFINITY vs. ORTIZ, KATRINA Motion No. 001 Page 1 of 3

## FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 03/18/2021 08:38 PM NYSCEF DOC. NO. 15

with her answer, which was due no later than April 28, 2019. <u>See</u> CPLR 403(b). As respondent never served such demand, there is no jurisdictional impediment to this proceeding being conducted in New York County. <u>See Kurfis v Shore Towers</u> <u>Condominium</u>, 48 AD3d 300 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2008).

Petitioner, by affidavit of its claims representative, a person with knowledge, establishes prima facie that respondent herein did not timely serve a Demand for Arbitration. The claims representative states that petitioner did not have any knowledge of such Demand for Arbitration until it received correspondence from the American Arbitration Association dated March 6, 2019.

This court agrees with petitioner that the affirmation of respondent's counsel stating that the Demand for Arbitration was timely served has no probative value, and is insufficient to raise an issue of fact. Nor does the documentary evidence in the form of petition filed by petitioner herein in a related matter, which appended to such attorney's affirmation, constitute is an acknowledgement that such Demand for Arbitration was timelv served. An examination of that prior petition demonstrates that such petition named Lamecca Hill-Perkins as the sole respondent. As petitioner has come forward with prima facie evidence that served the Demand for Arbitration respondent never upon petitioner, and that petitioner only obtained knowledge of such Demand on March 6, 2019, the court finds that the herein petition

## Page 2 of 3

was timely served on March 19, 2019, i.e. within the twenty-day period specified under CPLR 7503(c).

Finally, this court agrees with petitioner that the general release signed by respondent on September 19, 2017, wherein respondent released petitioner "from all. . .suits, actions, damages, claims or demands,. . ., including any and all known and unknown personal injuries Katrina Ortiz has or may have arising out of an incident that occurred at or near Linden Blvd, Brooklyn, NY 11202 on November 12, 2015, involving RICHARD L. PERKINS and LAMECCA HILL-PERKINS" applies to the arbitration at bar. See Matter of Travelers Home & Mar Ins Co v Fiumara, 164 AD3d 592 (2d Dept 2019). Contrary to respondent's argument, such release, by its terms, is not limited to a release of the counterclaim that the driver of the other vehicle involved in the collision interposed against Perkins, the driver of the vehicle in which respondent was a passenger.<sup>1</sup>

Vera A-Janez

20210318203823DJAMESDD16A273C61440939F17DE3A843EF0D8

3/10/2021					
DATE			DEBRA A. JAMES, J.S.C.		
CHECK ONE:	х	CASE DISPOSED	NON-FINAL DISPOSITION		
	х	GRANTED DENIED	GRANTED IN PART	OTHER	
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER	SUBMIT ORDER		
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:		INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN	FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT	REFERENCE	

0400004

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Nor has respondent come forward with any evidence of such counterclaim allegedly interposed against her, for example, as owner of the vehicle in which she was a passenger.