

Summary of Contents

Volume 1

- Chapter 1. Physician's Liability
- Chapter 2. Informed Consent
- Chapter 3. Causation
- Chapter 4. Vicarious Liability
- Chapter 5. Contribution and Indemnification
- Chapter 6. Municipal and Quasi-Municipal Corporations
- Chapter 7. Jurisdiction
- Chapter 8. Venue and Forum Non Conveniens

Volume 2

- Chapter 9. Statute of Limitations
- Chapter 10. Workers' Compensation
- Chapter 11. Collateral Estoppel and Res Judicata
- Chapter 12. Pleadings
- Chapter 13. Consolidation, Severance, Joint, and Bifurcated Trial
- Chapter 14. Default
- Chapter 15. Stipulations and Settlements
- Chapter 16. Discovery and Inspection
- Chapter 17. Depositions
- Chapter 18. Interrogatories and Notice to Admit
- Chapter 19. Physical Examinations and Exchange of Medical Records
- Chapter 20. *[Reserved]*
- Chapter 21. Summary Judgment

Volume 3

- Chapter 22. Evidence

NEW YORK MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

Chapter 23. Res Ipsa Loquitur

Chapter 24. Expert Testimony

Chapter 25. Trial

Chapter 26. Damages

Chapter 27. Periodic Payment of Judgments

Chapter 28. Arbitration

Chapter 29. Sanctions or Costs and Frivolous Conduct

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. PHYSICIAN’S LIABILITY

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 1:1 Medical malpractice defined and distinguished from negligence—Generally

II. UNLICENSED OR NOT BOARD-CERTIFIED PHYSICIAN

- § 1:2 Comment
- § 1:3 Unlicensed physician: Prima facie evidence of negligence—Statute
- § 1:4 Lack of board certification: Per se not incompetence

III. HOSPITAL RESIDENTS

A. GENERALLY

- § 1:5 Physician without limited permit: Not qualified to practice medicine
- § 1:6 Resident who assisted doctor: Not liable absent malpractice

B. HOSPITAL RESIDENTS’ DUTY OF CARE

- § 1:7 Comment
- § 1:8 The regulations
- § 1:9 Resident treating patient without supervision of licensed physician: Hospital liable

IV. NURSES

A. NURSES’ DUTY OF CARE

- § 1:10 The statute
- § 1:11 Nurse engaged in practice of medicine without license
- § 1:12 Liability of nurse anesthetist: Failure to order continuous monitoring

V. PHYSICIAN’S ASSISTANTS

A. PHYSICIAN’S ASSISTANTS’ DUTY OF CARE

- § 1:13 Statutes and regulations
- § 1:14 Supervising physician vicariously liable for negligence of physician’s assistant

VI. PHYSICIANS

A. PHYSICIAN-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP PREREQUISITE TO IMPOSITION OF MALPRACTICE LIABILITY ON PHYSICIAN

§ 1:15 Comment

B. PHYSICIAN-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP

1. Generally

§ 1:16 Off the cuff opinion may/may not create physician-patient relationship

§ 1:17 Telephone call to physician does/does not create physician-patient relationship

2. Physician Hired for Limited Purpose: Liability Limited: No Continuing Duty

§ 1:18 Consultant's and other physician's liability

§ 1:19 Admitting physician not responsible for treatment by other specialists

3. Independent Medical Examination

§ 1:20 Comment

§ 1:21 Impartial medical examination: Limited physician-patient relationship

§ 1:22 Police surgeon

4. Physician Hired by Workers' Compensation Carrier or Insurance Company

§ 1:23 Generally

§ 1:24 Physician not liable for failure to make proper diagnosis or failure to report a proper diagnosis

§ 1:25 Physician gives negligent advice: Physician-patient relationship and liability may exist

5. Physician Selected by Court or District Attorney

§ 1:26 Physician selected by court or district attorney: Immune from suit

6. Pre-Employment Physical

§ 1:27 Pre-employment physical: Physician may/may not be liable for negligence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7. Annual Physical Examination

- § 1:28 Annual physical examination: Physician may/may not be liable for negligence

8. Return to Work Examination

- § 1:29 Physician may/may not be liable for negligently permitting plaintiff to return to work

9. On-Call Physician

- § 1:30 Hospital rules and regulations require each physician to be on call: Physician liable
§ 1:31 On-call emergency-room physician and hospital: Liable/not liable
§ 1:32 On-call physician: Liable for failing to supervise treatment provided by residents properly
§ 1:33 On-call obstetrician: Liable/not liable
§ 1:34 On-call anesthesiologist: Hospital and chief of service may be liable
§ 1:35 On-call physician may be liable

C. VIOLATION/NO VIOLATION OF PHYSICIAN-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP

- § 1:36 Comment
§ 1:37 Physician liable for testifying falsely for insurance company to the detriment of his patient
§ 1:38 Disclosure of confidential information: Actionable but may be justified or excused
§ 1:39 Revealing patient's AIDS/abortion status: Punitive damages may be recoverable
§ 1:40 Physician not liable for violating privilege by testifying for defendant: privilege waived
§ 1:41 Use of photograph constitutes violation/no violation of physician-patient privilege

D. PAYMENT OF FEE TO PHYSICIAN UNNECESSARY TO IMPOSE DUTY OF CARE: GOOD SAMARITAN STATUTE

- § 1:42 Comment
- ### 1. Statutes
- § 1:43 Pub. Health Law § 3000-a
§ 1:44 Education Law § 6527(2)
- ### 2. Case Law
- § 1:45 Good Samaritan statute properly charged

- § 1:46 Emergency treatment: No gross negligence: Complaint dismissed
- § 1:47 New Jersey Good Samaritan Statute applicable: Complaint dismissed

E. PHYSICIAN'S THREE-FOLD DUTY

- § 1:48 Comment

F. MEDICAL JUDGMENT: ERRORS OF JUDGMENT, CHOOSING AMONG ACCEPTED ALTERNATIVES, BAD RESULT

- § 1:49 Comment

1. Medical Judgment Not Properly Exercised

- § 1:50 Choice not based on evaluation by a qualified physician
- § 1:51 Decision made without proper testing
- § 1:52 Honest error of judgment
- § 1:53 Decision made neglecting patient's history and other pertinent data
- § 1:54 Diagnosis made without regard of progressive symptoms

2. Permissible Exercise of Medical Judgment: No Liability

- § 1:55 Patient's history supports choice of treatment adopted
- § 1:56 Clinical evaluation and examination carefully made

3. Failure to Exercise Any Medical Judgment

- § 1:57 Physician fails to choose any acceptable modality of treatment: Error of judgment inapplicable

4. Choosing Among Acceptable Alternatives

- § 1:58 Comment

5. Bad Result Is Not Per Se Malpractice

- § 1:59 Comment

VII. THEORIES OF RECOVERY AS APPLIED IN CASES INVOLVING PARTICULAR PROCEDURES AND TREATMENT

A. GENERALLY

- § 1:60 Comment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B. ABANDONMENT

- § 1:61 Liability for abandoning patient

C. ABORTION

1. Abortion Negligently Performed

- § 1:62 Abortion negligently performed: Malpractice may be inferred from failure to use sharp curette: Absent proof its use would have changed the result, no recovery

2. Abortion Illegally Performed

- § 1:63 Abortion illegally performed: Abortion performed prior to statutory amendment permitting abortions: No recovery
- § 1:64 Abortion illegally performed: Abortion on 12-year-old: Recovery permitted despite penal law violation only if infant did not know procedure was illegal

3. Abortion Incompletely Performed

- § 1:65 Abortion incompletely performed: Failure to advise: Recovery for emotional distress

4. Abortion Because of Erroneous Advice

- § 1:66 HIV-positive patient relies on physician's erroneous advice in terminating pregnancy

D. AIDS AND AIDS PHOBIA

- § 1:67 Hospital may be liable to extern and nurse contracting AIDS
- § 1:68 Health care provider liable/not liable for giving blood transfusions containing HIV
- § 1:69 Health care provider not liable for addicted felon's acquiring AIDS in prison
- § 1:70 Health care provider did not use blood during plaintiff's operation: Not liable for plaintiff's AIDS
- § 1:71 Failure to use blood of the patient's family may render hospital liable
- § 1:72 AIDS partner may be liable for transmission of AIDS to companion
- § 1:73 Hospital not liable to wife for negligent treatment of husband's AIDS
- § 1:74 AIDS phobia

E. ADVICE NEGLIGENTLY GIVEN

- § 1:75 Liability for negligently given advice

F. AUTOPSY AND DEAD BODIES

- § 1:76 Comment

NEW YORK MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

- § 1:77 Performing autopsy over family objections
- § 1:78 Dead bodies: Violation of the right of sepulcher

G. ADMISSION TO OR DISCHARGE FROM HOSPITAL

- § 1:79 Failure to admit for diagnostic testing
- § 1:80 Failure to admit for observation
- § 1:81 Failure to admit psychiatric patient
- § 1:82 Premature discharge: Question of fact
- § 1:83 Failure to admit patient based on misreading of X-rays
- § 1:84 Physician's failure to call an ambulance to transport decedent to hospital

H. ALCOHOLISM

- § 1:85 Failure to advise motor vehicle department that driver was alcoholic: No liability

I. ANESTHESIA

- § 1:86 Anesthetic improperly injected outside proposed injection site
- § 1:87 Anesthesia resident and chairman of the department of anesthesia: Negligent
- § 1:88 Improper post-operative anesthesia monitoring
- § 1:89 Improper anesthetics and respiration assistance
- § 1:90 Halothane improperly used in presence of liver disease
- § 1:91 Dentures lodged in esophagus
- § 1:92 Failure to administer blood transfusion
- § 1:93 Epidural anesthesia improperly administered
- § 1:94 Anesthesiologist's failure to advise surgeon of severe drop in blood pressure: Failure of anesthesiologist to cancel surgery
- § 1:95 Esophagus injured during intubation
- § 1:96 Anesthesiologist not liable: Assumed duties after child was delivered
- § 1:97 Delay in calling anesthesiologist sooner: May be negligence
- § 1:98 Intubation vs. local anesthesia
- § 1:99 Patient fell off operating room table: Anesthesiologist not responsible: Nurse and surgeon are
- § 1:100 Anesthesiologist not responsible for patient's suicide
- § 1:101 Anesthesiologist not responsible: Plaintiff properly positioned
- § 1:102 Anesthesiologist used proper intubation tube
- § 1:103 Anesthesiologist not responsible to have code leader at surgery

TABLE OF CONTENTS

J. BURNS

- § 1:104 Contact with lamp during examination

K. COMPLAINTS UNHEEDED, UNTREATED, OR UNDIAGNOSED

- § 1:105 Complaints of back pain: Delay in diagnosis of cancer
§ 1:106 Complaints indicating drug abuse: Patient becomes drug abuser
§ 1:107 Complaints indicating meningitis: Death results
§ 1:108 Complaints of headaches symptomatic of berry aneurysm: Death results from ruptured aneurysm
§ 1:109 Failure to diagnose heart disease
§ 1:110 Failure to diagnose high fever
§ 1:111 Failure to treat plaintiff after nurse's telephone call: Delay in nurse in making the call

L. CONSULTATION WITH OR REFERRAL TO OTHER PHYSICIANS

1. Generally

- § 1:112 Liability of referring and covering physician

2. Failure to Seek Consultation/Improper Referral

- § 1:113 Failure to seek consultation
§ 1:114 Referral for consultation necessary if physician does not possess skill to treat patient
§ 1:115 Failure to refer to pulmonary specialist/gastroenterologist
§ 1:116 Referral to orthopedist: Proper
§ 1:117 Physician's referral of sick patient to nearest hospital not one to which physician could admit patient: Not liable
§ 1:118 Referring physician entitled to rely on referred physician's conclusion
§ 1:119 Resident's failure to consult with attending physicians

3. Referred Physician's Failure to Communicate or Discuss Findings With Referring Physician and/or Patient

- § 1:120 Failure to communicate mammogram findings to referring physician
§ 1:121 Failure to communicate X-ray findings
§ 1:122 Failure to communicate findings of CT scan to the plaintiff
§ 1:123 Failure to communicate: Generally

4. Miscellaneous Referral Issues

- § 1:124 Failure to refer patient to burn center where results are usually better: No liability

§ 1:125 Failure of hospital to convey treating physician's referral

M. DEHYDRATION

§ 1:126 Liability for dehydration

N. DELAY IN DIAGNOSIS OR TREATMENT

1. Generally

§ 1:127 Comment

2. Delay in Diagnosis or Treatment of Cancer,
Generally

§ 1:128 Delay in diagnosing cancer generally

3. Delay in Diagnosis or Treatment of Breast
Cancer

§ 1:129 The statute

§ 1:130 Failure to communicate findings of mammogram to referring
physician and/or patient

§ 1:131 Delay in diagnosing breast cancer resulting in more
disfiguring surgery

§ 1:132 Failure to discover breast cancer and pursue more aggressive
treatment

§ 1:133 Failure to timely discover breast cancer: Did not allow cancer
to advance from one stage to another: No physical injury
but emotional injury: Result the same

4. Delay in Diagnosis or Treatment of Other
Diseases

§ 1:134 Delay in diagnosing brain hemorrhage or brain tumor

§ 1:135 Delay in diagnosing pituitary tumor

§ 1:136 Delay in diagnosing lung condition

§ 1:137 Delay in treating kidney disease

§ 1:138 Delay in treating respiratory arrest

§ 1:139 Delay in treating arterial spasms

§ 1:140 Delay in performing caesarean section

§ 1:141 Delay in diagnosing and treating appendicitis

§ 1:142 Delay in diagnosing alkalosis

§ 1:143 Delay in diagnosing hyperparathyroidism

§ 1:144 Delay in treating hypothyroidism

§ 1:145 Delay in diagnosing infant's sepsis

§ 1:146 Delay in diagnosing glass in hand

§ 1:147 Delay in diagnosing herniated disc

§ 1:148 Delay in failing to remove foreign object from eye

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:149 Delay in responding to mother's telephone calls
- § 1:150 Delay in diagnosing knee injury
- § 1:151 Delay in diagnosing status of nerve condition: Failure to obtain objective signs of neurologic deficits
- § 1:152 Delay in performing surgery
- § 1:153 Delay in performing CAT scan
- § 1:154 Delay in diagnosing and treating spinal tuberculosis
- § 1:155 Delay in detecting perforation of colon
- § 1:156 Delay in rendering treatment resulting in blindness of infant
- § 1:157 Delay in timely diagnosing cardiac tamponade
- § 1:158 Delay in diagnosing detached retina
- § 1:159 Delay in making timely diagnosis for peripheral vascular disease
- § 1:160 Failure to timely diagnose bilateral pleural effusion
- § 1:161 Delay in treating carotid artery blockage
- § 1:162 Delay in treating craniosynostosis
- § 1:163 Delay in repairing an anastomosis
- § 1:164 Delay in treating perforation of esophagus
- § 1:165 Delay by orthopedist in treating compartment syndrome
- § 1:166 Failure to perform timely CAT scan and administer medication resulting in aneurysm

5. Delay by Hospital for Hours in Providing Appropriate Care to Plaintiff

- § 1:167 Delay in monitoring plaintiff's temperature for eight hours
- § 1:168 Delay of six hours in providing treatment
- § 1:169 Delay in three to four hours: Treating physician in conference: Hospital liable
- § 1:170 Delay of one-and-a-half to two hours in treating plaintiff in emergency room
- § 1:171 Delay of three hours: Plaintiff's obstetrician was busy: Hospital liable
- § 1:172 Inordinate delay in notifying plaintiff's physician

O. DELAY OR FAILURE TO PERFORM OR PROPERLY READ INDICATED TESTS

1. Failure to Perform or Order Test

- § 1:173 Failure to perform biopsy
- § 1:174 Failure to perform cysto-urethrogram
- § 1:175 Failure to perform bladder test
- § 1:176 Failure to perform diagnostic test which would have avoided surgery
- § 1:177 Failure to perform or properly perform blood tests and urinalysis

2. Failure to Take X-ray, CT Scan, Sonogram, or EKG

- § 1:178 Failure to take X-ray
- § 1:179 Failure to take CAT scan
- § 1:180 Failing to order timely sonogram
- § 1:181 Failure to take EKG
- § 1:182 Failure to order mammogram, thermagram, sonogram, needle aspiration

3. Failure to Read Test Results Properly: X-Rays, Mammograms, Tissues, Pathology Slides, and Diagnostic Tests

- § 1:183 Misreading X-rays
- § 1:184 Misreading of mammogram
- § 1:185 Misreading of pathology slides

4. Failure to Recommend Diagnostic Procedures

- § 1:186 Failure to recommend diagnostic procedure that would have disclosed lesion at an earlier stage of development

5. Failure to Advise Plaintiff of Results of Tests

- § 1:187 Failure to advise plaintiff of results of X-rays or that plaintiff had cancer

6. Failure to Take Test or Follow Chartered Course of Care

- § 1:188 Failure to take spinal tap
- § 1:189 Failure to follow chartered course of care
- § 1:190 Failure to retest blood for hepatitis
- § 1:191 Failure to diagnose and treat hemorrhage
- § 1:192 Failure to administer stain and amniotic glucose test

P. DRUGS

1. Generally

- § 1:193 Drugs and off-label use

2. Failure to Administer Drug

- § 1:194 Failure to administer drug to correct high blood pressure
- § 1:195 Failure to administer heparin
- § 1:196 Failure to administer antibiotics
- § 1:197 Drug properly/improperly used or not discontinued
- § 1:198 Drug contraindicated/negligently prescribed

3. Drug Abuse

- § 1:199 Failure to diagnose drug abuse

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:200 Causing drug addiction
- § 1:201 Causing drug reaction
- 4. Failure to Monitor Drug
- § 1:202 Failure to monitor drug properly: Physician not liable
- 5. Drug Causing Injury
- § 1:203 Drug causing injury: Physician liable/not liable
- § 1:204 Question of fact whether physician was negligent in prescribing and administering medicine
- § 1:205 Improperly dispensing wrong drug
- § 1:206 Drug manufacturer relieved of liability if warning to physician is adequate

Q. EMERGENCY ROOMS

1. Patient Dumping

- § 1:207 Comment
- § 1:208 Hospital is strictly liable for violation of federal dumping statute and plaintiff need not prove lack of treatment was for economic reasons
- § 1:209 Plaintiff failed to allege or prove that he did not receive appropriate treatment and was not stabilized: Claim dismissed
- § 1:210 EMTALA does not provide a private right of action against the individual physicians
- § 1:211 Physician who fails to treat under Pub. Health Law § 2805-b may be liable criminally
- § 1:212 Violation of Pub. Health Law § 2805-b does not give rise to cause of action for money damages

2. Failure to Admit, See, or Diagnose Patient

- § 1:213 Failure of attending to see patient in emergency room
- § 1:214 Failure to admit patient
- § 1:215 Failure to diagnose heart attack: Tragic: No liability
- § 1:216 Failure to diagnose thrombosis
- § 1:217 Failure to diagnose fracture
- § 1:218 Rape of patient in emergency room
- § 1:219 Failure to furnish head-trauma sheet
- § 1:220 Preventing admission to emergency room
- § 1:221 Failure to have blood or blood products available
- § 1:222 Patient admitted to hospital: Emergency room physician has no further duty of care
- § 1:223 Failure to diagnose tendon laceration

3. Emergency Medical Services

§ 1:224 Emergency medical service liability

R. EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

1. Generally

§ 1:225 Comment

2. Non-Birth-Related Emotional Distress Claims

- § 1:226 Child kidnapped from hospital nursery: Given to wrong mother to feed: Not actionable
- § 1:227 Failure to make timely diagnosis of child's meningitis
- § 1:228 Death or injury of infant child: Claim by parents or sibling
- § 1:229 Transfusion of mismatched blood to mother-in-law
- § 1:230 Wife told she has cancer
- § 1:231 Amputation of husband's leg
- § 1:232 Failure to timely or properly communicate with patient's family concerning patient's status—Informing daughter that mother had died when she had not
- § 1:233 —Informing mother that daughter was alive when she was not
- § 1:234 —Failing to notify wife of husband's hospitalization and death
- § 1:235 Display of photograph of child who died of leukemia as part of advertising campaign
- § 1:236 Failure to diagnose cancer
- § 1:237 Blood transfusion contrary to Jehovah Witnesses' refusal
- § 1:238 Yelling at plaintiff regarding the presence in the room of the service dog: Not actionable
- § 1:239 Patient overheard murder of another patient in the hospital: Not entitled to emotional damages

3. Birth-Related Claims for Emotional Distress

- § 1:240 Comment
- § 1:241 Physical pain associated with childbirth: Not recoverable
- § 1:242 Direct duty to plaintiff: Emotional distress recoverable
- § 1:243 Stillborn child: Mother recovers for emotional distress; physical injury
- § 1:244 Child born alive, though damaged: No cause of action for emotional distress by mother: Child has the cause of action for damages sustained during pregnancy
- § 1:245 Parents' viewing injury to or death of infant: No duty/no recovery: No zone of danger
- § 1:246 Mother smothers baby while asleep: May recover for emotional injuries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. FRACTURE

- § 1:247 Failure to diagnose fracture
- § 1:248 Failure to reduce fracture

T. IMPROPER DIAGNOSIS

- § 1:249 Comment
- § 1:250 Failure to diagnose and treat congestive heart failure
- § 1:251 Failure to diagnose gangrenous condition
- § 1:252 Failure to diagnose and treat Lyme disease
- § 1:253 Failure to diagnose esophageal perforation
- § 1:254 Failure to diagnose macrosomia
- § 1:255 Failure to diagnose aorta dissection
- § 1:256 Failure to diagnose cancer
- § 1:257 Failure to diagnose bilateral cholesteatoma
- § 1:258 Misdiagnosis of benign breast tumor as cancer
- § 1:259 Failure to diagnose bone cancer
- § 1:260 Failure to diagnose salicylate poisoning
- § 1:261 Misdiagnosis of myocardial infarction
- § 1:262 Failure to diagnose brain tumor
- § 1:263 Failure to diagnose hyperparathyroidism
- § 1:264 Failure to diagnose hydrocephalus
- § 1:265 Failure to diagnose lupus
- § 1:266 Failure to diagnose hearing loss
- § 1:267 Failure to diagnose blood clot
- § 1:268 Failure to control infection
- § 1:269 Failure to discover or locate infection
- § 1:270 Failure to timely diagnose acoustic neuroma
- § 1:271 Failure to diagnose Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever: No liability
- § 1:272 Failure to diagnose and treat plaintiff's eye injury
- § 1:273 Failure to diagnose pericardial effusion
- § 1:274 Failure to follow proper aseptic procedures
- § 1:275 Failure to diagnose and treat perforated diverticulum
- § 1:276 Failure to diagnose degenerative hip dislocation
- § 1:277 Failure to diagnose meningitis
- § 1:278 Failure to treat and diagnose stroke
- § 1:279 Failure to diagnose choriocarcinoma
- § 1:280 Failure to diagnose and treat abdominal pain: Summary judgment denied
- § 1:281 Failure to diagnose bilateral cholesteatoma
- § 1:282 Failure to diagnose congestive heart failure
- § 1:283 Failure to diagnose and treat angina
- § 1:284 Failure to diagnose infection leading to death

U. INJECTION

- § 1:285 Negligent administration of injection
- § 1:286 Patient left unattended after injection
- § 1:287 Patient received mysterious injection of Pavlulon: Hospital may be liable
- § 1:288 Injection causing infection
- § 1:289 Injection did not take place in the emergency room

V. OBSTETRICAL AND GYNECOLOGICAL CARE

1. Obstetrical Care

a. Midwifery

- § 1:290 Comment
- § 1:291 The statute
- § 1:292 Midwife must consult with physician: Failure to do so: Physician not liable
- § 1:293 Nurse midwife consulted with physician: Physician may be held liable
- § 1:294 Nurse midwife entitled to directed verdict/summary judgment

b. Improper Use of Forceps

- § 1:295 Trauma to infant
- § 1:296 Forceps delivery: Pelvimetry: Caesarean section
- § 1:297 Trauma to mother: Forceps delivery: Pelvimetry: Delay in delivery

c. Erb's Palsy

- § 1:298 Erb's palsy per se does not indicate negligence
- § 1:299 Excessive downward traction during delivery: Trauma to infant
- § 1:300 Resident's improper treatment of shoulder dystocia

d. Caesarean Section

- § 1:301 Trauma to infant
- § 1:302 Trauma to mother

e. Improper Obstetrical Care

- § 1:303 Comment
- § 1:304 Commissioner's regulation concerning Pitocin
- § 1:305 Improper use of Pitocin, monitoring, testing, etc. during delivery causing cerebral palsy and/or death
- § 1:306 Failure to diagnose feto-pelvic disproportion
- § 1:307 Failure to administer antibiotics

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:308 Failure to discover, diagnose and treat pre-eclampsia resulting in death of mother
- § 1:309 Failure to diagnose mother's ruptured aneurysm
- § 1:310 Failure of physician to go to hospital after advising patient who believed she was in labor to go to hospital: Not liable
- § 1:311 Failure to issue further instructions to residents
- § 1:312 Death of mother or stillborn fetus or infant

f. Postnatal Care

- § 1:313 Regulations of Commissioner relating to post-partum care of the mother
- § 1:314 Dropping baby
- § 1:315 Administration of oxygen to infant causing retrolental fibroplasia
- § 1:316 Failure to monitor I.V. properly
- § 1:317 Failure to treat hyperbilirubinemia
- § 1:318 Failure to treat hypothyroidism
- § 1:319 Failure of the hospital to diagnose and treat prolapse cord
- § 1:320 Failure to treat mother's postpartum infection
- § 1:321 Negligent post-delivery care
- § 1:322 Failure to diagnose infant's postnatal risk to mother's toxoplasmosis infection

2. GYNECOLOGY

- § 1:323 Failure to conduct pelvic examination claimed as cause for later hysterectomy
- § 1:324 Negligently caused fistula
- § 1:325 Premature performance of total hysterectomy
- § 1:326 Improperly performed tubal ligation/sterilization procedure
- § 1:327 Failure to remove IUD from pregnant wearer
- § 1:328 Endometrial resection: Properly performed

W. LOSS OF PARENTAL CONSORTIUM

- § 1:329 No cause of action for loss of parental consortium for injuries inflicted on the parent by third parties

X. ORDERS

- § 1:330 Failure to give postoperative orders
- § 1:331 Failure to enforce physician's own orders
- § 1:332 Failure to follow orders
- § 1:333 Following orders exonerates hospital

Y. POST-OPERATIVE CARE

- § 1:334 Physician's orders or actions clearly contraindicated; hospital

NEW YORK MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

- may be responsible for carrying out physician's orders or directives without further inquiry
- § 1:335 Inadequate post-operative care

Z. PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

- § 1:336 Comment
- § 1:337 Failure to restrain or excessive restraints
- § 1:338 Negligent release, improper grant of privileges, or proper exercise of medical judgment
- § 1:339 Failure to prevent escape
- § 1:340 Erroneous diagnosis
- § 1:341 Treatment by unqualified physician
- § 1:342 Failure to maintain adequate supervision
- § 1:343 Failure to remove means of self-destruction
- § 1:344 Failure to provide adequate window guards
- § 1:345 Patient injured by assault of another patient
- § 1:346 Failure to hospitalize
- § 1:347 Sexual liaison with patient

AA. SEXUAL ABUSE OR CHILD ABUSE

- § 1:348 Hospital not liable for reporting sexual abuse/child abuse

BB. SIDE RAILS, BED RAILS, RESTRAINTS AND FALLS FOR OTHER REASONS

- § 1:349 Failure to raise side rails
- § 1:350 According to physician's orders, a patient does not require supervision: Medical center not responsible for fall

CC. SUPERVISION

- § 1:351 Surgeon supervising resident—Resident not liable

DD. SURGERY

1. Contraindicated Surgery
- § 1:352 Liability for contraindicated surgery
2. Clearance for Surgery
- § 1:353 Liability for negligence in clearing patient for surgery
3. Unnecessary Surgery
- § 1:354 Liability for unnecessary surgery
4. Foreign Object Left in Body
- § 1:355 Liability for foreign object left in body

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5. Negligently Performed Surgery

- § 1:356 Comment
- § 1:357 Colonoscopy
- § 1:358 Ear surgery
- § 1:359 Elbow surgery
- § 1:360 Exploratory surgery
- § 1:361 Foot surgery
- § 1:362 Hand surgery
- § 1:363 Heart surgery
- § 1:364 Hernia surgery
- § 1:365 Knee surgery
- § 1:366 Bunionectomy
- § 1:367 Surgery on the palate
- § 1:368 Removal of penile warts
- § 1:369 Plastic surgery
- § 1:370 Thyroidectomy
- § 1:371 Urological surgery
- § 1:372 Vascular surgery
- § 1:373 Vasectomy
- § 1:374 Wrist surgery
- § 1:375 Breast reconstruction surgery
- § 1:376 Aorto-iliac bypass graft surgery
- § 1:377 Brain tumor
- § 1:378 Dilatation and curettage
- § 1:379 Cerebral aneurysm
- § 1:380 Spinal surgery
- § 1:381 Bowel obstruction
- § 1:382 Eye surgery
- § 1:383 Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)
- § 1:384 Misfiring of stapler during bariatric surgery
- § 1:385 Delay in performing spinal fusion
- § 1:386 Negligently performed tubal ligation

EE. Wrongful Life

- § 1:387 Comment
- § 1:388 No recovery for wrongful life
- § 1:389 Parents may recover for increased expenses in raising infant:
 Infant may not recover for expenses to be incurred beyond
 majority
- § 1:390 Wrongfully prolonging decedent's life contrary to do not
 resuscitate orders: Not actionable

FF. Pre-Conception Tort

- § 1:391 Pre-conception tort: No liability

GG. Wrongful Pregnancy and Birth

- § 1:392 Comment
- § 1:393 Unwanted child: No recovery because of negligently performed tubal ligation, vasectomy or failed abortion
- § 1:394 Failure to diagnose pregnancy
- § 1:395 Tuboplasty
- § 1:396 Negligent failure to advise mother she is incapable of caring for children: Not actionable

VIII. HEALTH CARE PROVIDER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THIRD PARTIES

- § 1:397 Comment
- § 1:398 The regulations
- § 1:399 Physician's duty of care owed to parents
- § 1:400 Physicians owe no duty to friend of woman who was being treated by physicians for infectious meningitis: No special relationship
- § 1:401 Physician owes no duty to a wife because failed surgical procedure diminished husband's fertility capacity
- § 1:402 Physician and/or health-related facility not liable to plaintiff for failure to warn or prevent patient from driving
- § 1:403 Psychiatrist owes no duty to child of psychotic patient who stabbed her own child
- § 1:404 Children's center owes no duty to infant plaintiffs assaulted by babysitter-resident of the institution
- § 1:405 Counselor of wife not responsible for shooting husband
- § 1:406 Hospital owed no duty to nurse who, while attending to a patient, was attacked by the patient
- § 1:407 Hospital had no duty to protect decedent from assault committed by her former paramour patient
- § 1:408 Ophthalmologist owes no duty to father or his children to warn that they can be born with heredity form of eye cancer for which defendant treated the father
- § 1:409 Physicians owed no duty to plaintiff who had the decedent's healthcare proxy

IX. THEORIES OTHER THAN MALPRACTICE

A. BREACH OF CONTRACT AND/OR FRAUD

- § 1:410 Comment
- § 1:411 Physician violates agreement not to perform blood transfusion
- § 1:412 Blood transfusion and prescription of prosthetic device: Not sale of a product
- § 1:413 Prescription of drugs: Not a sale

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:414 Mistakenly implanted embryo: Physicians liable for negligence
- § 1:415 Bankruptcy: Failure to list malpractice claim bars suit: Failure to timely move bars defense
- § 1:416 Hospital's liability: Failing to assure physician has insurance
- § 1:417 Organ donation under Pub. Health Law Articles 43 and 43(a)

B. LIABILITY OF OTHER PARTIES

- § 1:418 Liability of hospital director/department head

X. HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION (HMO) LIABILITY AND PREEMPTION BY ERISA

- § 1:419 Comment
- § 1:420 The statute
- § 1:421 HMO vicariously liable for malpractice of its employee-physician
- § 1:422 Treating physician's delay in filling out special referral form for approval of treatment by a non-participating physician: Not preempted
- § 1:423 HMO not vicariously liable for independent contractors

XI. CAPITATION NEGLIGENCE

- § 1:424 Comment
- § 1:425 Capitation negligence not a separate cause of action
- § 1:426 If plaintiff proves that treatment was not given for capitation reasons, punitive damages may be awarded

XII. STATUTORY LIABILITY

- § 1:427 Hospital liable for violating public health law in performing autopsy over objection of the family
- § 1:428 Violation of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 may/may not state a cause of action
- § 1:429 Violation of Pub. Health Law 2801-d, 2803-c(3)(e) provides a private cause of action against residential health care facility
- § 1:430 Violation of Pub. Health Law 2805-b does not provide a private action for civil damages

XIII. PIERCING CORPORATE VEIL

- § 1:431 Corporate veil may be pierced to reach malpractice insurance

CHAPTER 2. INFORMED CONSENT

I. INTRODUCTION

§ 2:1 Generally

II. THEORETICAL BASIS

§ 2:2 Comment

§ 2:3 Informed consent sounds in malpractice

§ 2:4 Lack of any consent constitutes battery: Not informed consent

III. SCOPE OF DISCLOSURE

A. INTRODUCTION

§ 2:5 Comment

B. THE COMMON LAW

§ 2:6 The common law

§ 2:7 Duty of disclosure under the statute is limited to physicians, dentists, and podiatrists; optometrists owe common-law duty

§ 2:8 Common-law duty of reasonable care owed to non-patients

C. STATUTES

§ 2:9 Pub. Health Law § 2805-d(1)

§ 2:10 Pub. Health Law § 2503

§ 2:11 Pub. Health Law § 2441(5)

D. SUFFICIENCY OF DISCLOSURE AS TO RISKS

§ 2:12 Risks and alternatives to mastectomy: Effectiveness of procedure

§ 2:13 Risks of whole-cell diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis (DTP)

§ 2:14 Risks of abortion

§ 2:15 Risks of colonoscopy and polypectomy

§ 2:16 Risks of hand surgery

§ 2:17 Risks of proctocolectomy

§ 2:18 Risk of blood transfusion

§ 2:19 Failure to disclose side effects of electroconvulsive therapy

§ 2:20 Physician under no duty to advise patient that drug or product prescribed is an off-label use

§ 2:21 Duty of disclosure under consumer fraud statutes applicable to providers of medical services

§ 2:22 Eye surgery

§ 2:23 Risks of paresthesia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:24 Risks of eye surgery by plastic surgeon rather than oculoplastic surgeon
- § 2:25 Risk of titanium rod inserted in spine breaking
- § 2:26 Risks and alternatives to hair transplants
- § 2:27 Risks of surgeon having hepatitis
- § 2:28 Risk of scarring from surgery

E. SUFFICIENCY OF DISCLOSURE AS TO ALTERNATIVES

- § 2:29 Alternatives to cholangiopancreatography
- § 2:30 Alternatives to hemorrhoidectomy
- § 2:31 Alternatives to mastectomy—Alternative to removal of breast
- § 2:32 —Alternative to quadrantectomy
- § 2:33 Alternatives to thoracotomy
- § 2:34 Risks of episiotomy

IV. WHO HAS DUTY TO DISCLOSE

A. INTRODUCTION

- § 2:35 Comment

B. FAMILY PHYSICIAN

- § 2:36 Family physician

C. REFERRED AND CONSULTING PHYSICIANS

- § 2:37 Referred and consulting physicians

D. SURGEONS AND ASSISTANT SURGEONS

- § 2:38 Surgeons and assistant surgeons

E. ACTUAL PROVIDER OF MEDICAL TREATMENT

- § 2:39 Informed consent obtained by treating doctor precludes liability of referring doctor for failing to do so

F. INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ANOTHER PHYSICIAN

- § 2:40 One health care provider may rely on information provided by another health care provider but not without risk

G. SUBSTITUTE PHYSICIAN

- § 2:41 Ghost surgery: Consent to surgery by one doctor but performed by another doctor

H. HOSPITAL

- § 2:42 Hospital has no independent duty to obtain informed consent unless it has reason to believe an informed consent was not obtained by doctor or where doctor is performing procedure that is novel, unindicated, or contraindicated

I. INSURER

- § 2:43 Insurer has no duty to disclose risks of EKG

J. MANUFACTURER

- § 2:44 Manufacturer of defective product not liable for lack of informed consent

V. WHO MAY GIVE CONSENT

A. STATUTES

- § 2:45 Pub. Health Law § 2504
§ 2:46 Pub. Health Law § 2442
§ 2:47 Federal and state regulations regarding sterilization and abortion

B. CASE LAW

- § 2:48 Guardian of patients
§ 2:49 Parents of minors
§ 2:50 Parent of minors in utero
§ 2:51 Incapacitated persons

VI. WHEN MUST THERE BE DISCLOSURE

- § 2:52 Statutes
§ 2:53 Comment
§ 2:54 Noninvasive treatment: Informed consent inapplicable
§ 2:55 Prescription for drugs: Informed consent applicable/not applicable
§ 2:56 Emergency situation: Consent not required: Physician not liable
§ 2:57 Emergency situation: Question of fact whether emergency existed
§ 2:58 Sexual liaison: Informed consent inapplicable

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:59 Disclosure not required for risks that are remote, immaterial, uncommon, rare, or not foreseeable
- § 2:60 Disclosure not required for unnecessary or unindicated surgery
- § 2:61 Failure to disclose qualifications of a physician or that a medical resident will treat the plaintiff: Not actionable
- § 2:62 Failure to inform patient as to limited role of psychotherapy clinic advisory board: Not actionable
- § 2:63 Physician not liable for failure to provide special counseling before performing abortion
- § 2:64 Experimental or novel treatment and human research studies—Comment
- § 2:65 —Statute
- § 2:66 —At common law: Hospital not liable for experimental surgery unless it knew that surgery was malpractice per se, or it knew or should have known that informed consent was lacking
- § 2:67 —Prophylactic breast removal to treat precancerous condition required full disclosure including controversy in medical profession over such treatment
- § 2:68 —Hospital and doctor instituting experimental treatment liable: Resident who followed orders: Not liable
- § 2:69 —No duty to inform patient or her husband of experiments performed on blood removed for another purpose though experiment revealed contagious disease
- § 2:70 —Defendant doctor was required to inform patient of experimental nature of procedure
- § 2:71 —Doctor liable for convincing plaintiff, without full disclosure, to undergo “alternative” rather than conventional treatment for cancer
- § 2:72 —No liability for failure to obtain written informed consent based on experimental treatment that followed standard treatment where injury was from standard treatment that was easily differentiated from experimental treatment

VII. PROXIMATE CAUSE

A. STATUTE

- § 2:73 Statute

B. INTRODUCTION

- § 2:74 Comment
- § 2:75 Objective standard: The plaintiff’s testimony is admissible as to what a reasonably prudent person would have done but not necessary or controlling
- § 2:76 Plaintiff must prove causal relationship between non-

- disclosure and injury: Risk required to be disclosed must materialize: Interrogatory asking if parents consented to treatment erroneous: Reasonable person standard applicable
- § 2:77 Plaintiff proved injury occurred from nondisclosure: Entitled to all injuries sustained but for the procedure plaintiff would not have undergone

C. REASONABLY PRUDENT PERSON WOULD/ WOULD NOT HAVE CONSENTED TO TREATMENT

1. Reasonably Prudent Person Would Have Consented

- § 2:78 Inconceivable that a reasonably prudent person would have declined treatment for life threatening illness; parents may not deprive child of life-saving treatment where alternative is death
- § 2:79 Reasonably prudent person would have consented to taking drug
- § 2:80 Reasonably prudent person would have consented to arteriogram
- § 2:81 Reasonably prudent person would have consented to myelogram procedure: Finding that the risk was foreseeable: Against the weight of the evidence
- § 2:82 Reasonably prudent person would have consented to removal of blackheads and drainage of cysts
- § 2:83 Reasonably prudent person would have consented to C-section after delay

2. Reasonably Prudent Person Would Not Have Consented

- § 2:84 Reasonably prudent mother would not have consented to progesterone
- § 2:85 Reasonably prudent person would not have consented to fistulotomy: Alternate procedure was safer and would have been “preferred alternative”
- § 2:86 Reasonably prudent person would not have consented to radial keratotomy
- § 2:87 Reasonably prudent person would not have consented to modified mastectomy operation: Less invasive alternative treatments available
- § 2:88 Summary judgment unavailable to defendant absent proof that reasonably prudent person would not refuse the procedure
- § 2:89 Reasonably prudent person would not have consented to tubal ligation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:90 Plaintiff failed to prove reasonable person would not have consented to procedure

D. PROOF THAT INJURY WAS DUE TO FAILURE TO PROPERLY INFORM THE PLAINTIFF OF THE RISKS

- § 2:91 Plaintiff's testimony that he would not have undergone procedure had he been informed rebuts contention that the information would have made no difference
- § 2:92 Plaintiff failed to establish that the injury was due to failure to properly inform the plaintiff of the risks of the procedure

VIII. DEFENSES

A. STATUTE

- § 2:93 Pub. Health Law § 2805-d(4)

B. DISCLOSURE WOULD NOT HAVE CHANGED DECISION TO UNDERGO TREATMENT

- § 2:94 Patient assured doctor she would undergo treatment regardless of risks involved: Question of fact: Comparative negligence is a partial defense to an informed consent claim

C. DISCLOSURE TO SOMEONE OTHER THAN PATIENT

- § 2:95 Disclosure to family members when patient's condition would be adversely affected by direct disclosure

D. SIGNED CONSENT FORM MAY/MAY NOT SUPPORT A VERDICT FOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDER

- § 2:96 Comment
- § 2:97 Mere signing of a standard or general or generic consent form is insufficient to satisfy the physician's duty to disclose
- § 2:98 Standard or general consent form: Irrelevant, worthless, ineffectual, or inadmissible in evidence
- § 2:99 Consent form signed when the patient's awareness is affected presents question of fact that bars summary judgment
- § 2:100 Specific consent form and oral disclosure sufficient to warrant verdict or summary judgment for defendant
- § 2:101 Consent form, videotapes, and full discussion of procedure with plaintiff sufficient to warrant summary judgment
- § 2:102 Consent form plus oral disclosure: Question of fact

- § 2:103 Specific consent form to sterilization procedure for Medicaid patient obtained during labor not valid
- § 2:104 Alteration of consent form may/may not preclude summary judgment
- § 2:105 Consent form in English may be invalid to a Spanish-speaking person

IX. EXPERT TESTIMONY

A. STATUTE

- § 2:106 CPLR 4401-a

B. OVERVIEW

- § 2:107 Comment

C. EXPERT TESTIMONY ESTABLISHING THE QUALITATIVE INSUFFICIENCY OF THE CONSENT

- § 2:108 Failure to submit expert testimony at trial establishing the qualitative insufficiency of the consent requires dismissal

D. REQUIREMENT OF EXPERT TESTIMONY AS TO THE REASONABLY PRUDENT PERSON

- § 2:109 Comment
- § 2:110 Expert testimony as to the reasonably prudent person is not necessary
- § 2:111 Expert testimony as to the reasonably prudent person required: Questioned

E. EXPERT TESTIMONY REQUIREMENT SATISFIED/NOT SATISFIED BY TESTIMONY OF DEFENDANT OR DEFENSE WITNESS

- § 2:112 Testimony of defendant and/or defense witness sufficient to establish lack of informed consent even in absence of plaintiff's noncompliance with CPLR 4401-a
- § 2:113 Testimony of defendant insufficient to establish lack of informed consent

F. SUFFICIENCY/INSUFFICIENCY OF EXPERT TESTIMONY TO ESTABLISH LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT

- § 2:114 Expert testimony at trial sufficient to establish lack of informed consent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:115 Expert testimony at trial insufficient or inadequate or missing

G. EXPERT TESTIMONY ON SUMMARY JUDGMENT

- § 2:116 Defendant fails to make a prima facie case for summary judgment: Motion denied
§ 2:117 Defense expert testimony on summary judgment insufficient to sustain defendant's burden
§ 2:118 Summary judgment denied: Issue of fact as to whether plaintiff gave an informed consent

X. TRIAL

A. EVIDENCE

- § 2:119 Physicians may testify to their customary practice regarding information imparted to patients undergoing similar procedures
§ 2:120 Qualifications of expert

B. DISMISSAL

- § 2:121 Error to dismiss plaintiff's case before completion of proof

C. PROOF RESTRICTED TO ALLEGATIONS IN PLEADINGS

- § 2:122 Plaintiff's proof restricted to allegations in the pleadings

D. PRECLUSION OF EXPERT TESTIMONY BASED ON INADEQUATE DISCLOSURE

- § 2:123 Preclusion of expert testimony based upon inadequate disclosure

E. INSTRUCTIONS TO JURY

- § 2:124 Instruction erroneous: Reasonable person rule not charged
§ 2:125 Instruction correct: Reasonable person rule; proximate cause
§ 2:126 Scope of disclosure: Erroneous instruction
§ 2:127 Charge as a whole not erroneous
§ 2:128 Failure to instruct charge on proximate cause: Error: Charge permitting recovery for wrongful life: Erroneous

F. INTERROGATORIES

- § 2:129 Interrogatory in verdict sheet improper

§ 2:130 Not charging informed consent proper

G. DEFENSES

§ 2:131 Instructions under Pub. Health Law § 2805-d(4): Culpable conduct

H. VERDICT

§ 2:132 Verdict for defendant supported by the evidence

§ 2:133 Verdict for defendant not supported by the evidence

§ 2:134 Verdict for plaintiffs supported by the evidence

§ 2:135 Verdict for plaintiff not supported by the evidence

§ 2:136 Verdict consistent/not inconsistent

§ 2:137 Failure to dismiss informed consent claim harmless error where negligence established

XI. PLEADINGS

A. SUFFICIENCY OF PLEADINGS

§ 2:138 Informed consent is separate cause of action and should be separately pleaded

§ 2:139 Failure to allege reasonable person would not have consented to treatment

§ 2:140 Complaint sufficient: Affirmative defense insufficient

B. AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT TO ADD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INFORMED CONSENT

§ 2:141 Amendment not permitted

§ 2:142 Amendment permitted

C. PARTICULARIZATION OF CLAIM

§ 2:143 Claim sufficiently particularized

§ 2:144 Particularization of elements of claim

§ 2:145 Particularization of affirmative defenses

XII. APPLICABLE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS TO INFORMED CONSENT IS 2 1/2 YEARS (CPLR 214-A)

§ 2:146 Statute of limitation: One year, 90 days against municipal hospital and 2 1/2 years against treating physician who treated plaintiff for free in his office and no fee at the hospital

CHAPTER 3. CAUSATION

I. INTRODUCTION

§ 3:1 Generally

II. TO ESTABLISH PRIMA FACIE CAUSATION PLAINTIFF MUST SHOW THE DEPARTURES CITED DID MORE PROBABLY THAN NOT CAUSE THE RESULTING INJURY

A. CAUSATION OF INJURIES AT BIRTH

§ 3:2 Drug's known effects include perinatal hypoxia, statistically the most common cause of athetoid cerebral palsy: Prima facie case established

§ 3:3 Causation of injuries at birth: Evidence sufficient: Expert need not quantify the extent the defendant's negligence decreased the chance of success

§ 3:4 Causation of injuries at birth: Evidence insufficient

B. DELAY IN DIAGNOSING INCURABLE DISEASE

§ 3:5 No proximate cause where delay in diagnosing incurable disease made no difference in outcome

C. DEPARTURES NOT CAUSALLY RELATED TO INJURY

§ 3:6 No causation from failure to x-ray undetectable particles

§ 3:7 Failure to monitor urine output not a proximate cause of damages

§ 3:8 Bowel perforation following colonoscopy: No proximate cause

§ 3:9 Ten-day delay in removing foreign object from eye not causally related to injury

§ 3:10 Premature removal of cast was not a proximate cause of injury

§ 3:11 No causation where no way of knowing whether injury occurred before treatment

§ 3:12 Failure to administer nerve block injections not connected to injury

§ 3:13 No proximate cause for needless course of radiation absent expert testimony establishing causation

§ 3:14 Original misdiagnosis supplanted by later contrary diagnosis: Not proximate cause

§ 3:15 Physician not liable for failing to advise anesthesiologist of patient's last oral intake where anesthesiologist was aware of last oral intake

§ 3:16 Negligent prescription of drug: Not proximate cause of plaintiff's psychiatric condition

- § 3:17 Change of one psychiatric drug for another not the proximate cause of death
- § 3:18 Delay in treating cholesteatoma and hearing loss: Not proximate cause of plaintiff's injuries
- § 3:19 Proximate cause not established absent expert testimony addressing causation
- § 3:20 Plaintiff must distinguish, through expert testimony, pain caused by preexisting condition from pain caused by negligence
- § 3:21 Delay in administering drug to dissolve clots: Causation not established

D. EVIDENCE SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH DEPARTURES CAUSALLY RELATED TO INJURY

- § 3:22 Delay in surgical removal of glass: Jury question
- § 3:23 Delay in diagnosing osteomyelitis: Question of fact
- § 3:24 Delay in diagnosing nerve damage: Issue for jury
- § 3:25 Improperly placed retractor: Proximate cause of nerve damage
- § 3:26 Improperly performed cut down procedure: Proximate cause of injury to nerve
- § 3:27 Delay in diagnosing bacterial endocarditis: Question of fact
- § 3:28 Delay in diagnosing cancer: Question of fact

E. DAMAGES LIMITED TO PERIOD OF DELAY

- § 3:29 Damages limited to period of delay

F. FALLS

- § 3:30 Fall from hospital bed
- § 3:31 Fall from wheelchair

G. UNFORESEEABLE EVENT

- § 3:32 Result arises from unforeseeable event: No proximate cause

III. EXACERBATING OR PRECIPITATING PLAINTIFF'S INJURY OR DISABILITY, OR DIMINISHING THE CHANCE OF CURE

A. INTRODUCTION

- § 3:33 Comment

B. THERE MAY BE MULTIPLE CAUSES OF AN INJURY

- § 3:34 Plaintiff need not eliminate all possibility that the preexisting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- disease was solely responsible for the loss of motion: To defeat or limit recovery for precipitating a disability, it is defendant's burden to show when the condition would have arisen without his malpractice
- § 3:35 Since the defendant's malpractice need not be the sole proximate cause, it need only be "a" cause of an injury, not "the" cause
- § 3:36 Accident precipitating delirium tremens, DT, which hastens death was proximate cause despite fact that DT might have happened regardless
- C. EVIDENCE OF DIMINISHED CHANCE OF CURE/SURVIVAL OR OF LESSER INJURY**
- § 3:37 Sufficient evidence of diminished chance of cure/survival/ quality of life with cancer
- § 3:38 Sufficient evidence of diminished chance of cure/survival with cardiac condition
- § 3:39 Sufficient evidence of diminished chance of avoiding injuries from infection; diminution need not be quantified
- § 3:40 Sufficient evidence of diminished chance of avoiding injuries from bleed/stroke
- § 3:41 Sufficient evidence of diminished chance of avoiding injuries at birth; diminution need not be quantified
- § 3:42 Evidence of loss of even a 5% to 10% chance is "substantial" and establishes causation
- D. EVIDENCE OF ADDITIONAL LOSS OF FUNCTION**
- § 3:43 Evidence of additional 20% loss of kidney function due to delay in diagnosis establishes causation
- E. EVIDENCE OF INCREASE IN RISK OF INJURY**
- § 3:44 Evidence that departure doubled the risk of injury established jury question as to causation
- § 3:45 Evidence of four fold increase of risk of injury was sufficient to establish causation
- F. EVIDENCE OF EXACERBATION OF CONDITION**
- § 3:46 Proof that medication exacerbated bleeding time was sufficient to establish that it caused stroke
- G. DEPRIVATION OF BETTER CHANCE OF SUCCESS OR LESS RADICAL PROCEDURE**
- § 3:47 Erroneous diagnosis delays corrective surgery: Necessitates

- more extensive surgical procedure and results in greater degree of atrophy and pain
- § 3:48 Insufficient evidence that skin graft would have resulted in reduced scarring had procedure been performed at a specialized burn center
- § 3:49 Absent proof that tumor could have been completely excised by less radical procedure, plaintiff can only recover damages for having had to undergo two operations instead of one
- § 3:50 Evidence supports finding that delay in treating throat cancer was not a proximate cause of removal of larynx

IV. NO PROXIMATE CAUSE IF IT WOULD NOT HAVE MADE ANY DIFFERENCE IN OUTCOME OF INJURIES OR DEATH IF A DIFFERENT COURSE OF ACTION WAS TAKEN

- § 3:51 No proximate cause absent evidence that curative steps could have been taken
- § 3:52 No causation absent evidence that earlier detection of aneurysm would have prevented post surgical cerebral vasospasm
- § 3:53 No evidence that additional call by nurse to obstetrician would have resulted in earlier cesarean section breached causal connection with failure to make call
- § 3:54 Evidence indicated that referral to physician for cesarean section would have made no difference since three physicians subsequently determined cesarean section was unnecessary
- § 3:55 No evidence indicating that allegedly proper treatment would have prevented heart attack
- § 3:56 No evidence that calling another specialist would have resulted in different treatment or different outcome
- § 3:57 Negligence in treating severed finger not causally related where evidence indicates finger could not be reattached
- § 3:58 Delay in diagnosis of cancer made no difference in outcome
- § 3:59 No evidence that delay in diagnosis of endometriosis made difference in outcome
- § 3:60 Delay in expediting Medicaid approval for kidney transplant was not causally related to decedent's death where no liver donor available

V. INTERVENING, SUPERSEDING CAUSE

A. INTRODUCTION

- § 3:61 Comment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B. CONDUCT FOUND NOT SUPERSEDING AS A MATTER OF LAW

- § 3:62 Suicide as a result of negligence was foreseeable and not superseding
- § 3:63 Elective abortion brought about by malpractice/negligence not superseding
- § 3:64 Subsequent negligence by specialist to whom defendant doctor referred patient not superseding cause
- § 3:65 Subsequent negligence by another doctor in committing same malpractice not superseding
- § 3:66 Modification of prescription not superseding
- § 3:67 Decedent's elopement from hospital not superseding as a matter of law
- § 3:68 Plaintiff's decision to have second operation against treating physicians' advice: Question of fact as to superseding cause
- § 3:69 Criminal act: Question of fact as to whether criminal act of a third party was a superseding cause

C. SUPERSEDING CAUSE AS A MATTER OF LAW

- § 3:70 Failure to properly respond to fetal distress was superseding cause
- § 3:71 Doctor's failure to pass on warning was superseding cause
- § 3:72 Suicide two months after nerve injury was superseding cause
- § 3:73 Plaintiff's negligence: Superseding cause of injury
- § 3:74 Puncture wound following surgery: Superseding cause

VI. JURY CHARGE

- § 3:75 Malpractice of subsequent hospital entitles first hospital to jury instruction as to intervening-superseding cause
- § 3:76 Jury was properly charged that they must find substantial possibility that proper medical treatment would have avoided the result, and mere possibility of recovery may not be charged
- § 3:77 Jury properly charged that it must find that what the plaintiff lost, if it was substantial, was more likely than not lost due to the malpractice and that to be substantial, the chance lost was not required to be more than 50% but had to be more than slight
- § 3:78 Charge that jury must find negligence a substantial factor in bringing about death was no different from requested language of substantial possibility of preventing death
- § 3:79 Charge must indicate that there must be a "substantial possibility" that the decedent would have recovered
- § 3:80 Charging the jury that plaintiff must demonstrate a

- “substantial probability” that the defendant’s conduct caused the injury was error
- § 3:81 Fundamental error to charge jury that it must find “but for the doctor’s negligence, plaintiff would have led a normal life”
- § 3:82 Error to give only loss of chance instruction on proximate cause where theories were not only in the nature of loss of chance; but error harmless under circumstances
- § 3:83 Error to fail to charge that deprivation of a substantial chance for a cure can constitute a proximate cause of injuries and/or death where evidence provides rational basis; no error where it does not
- § 3:84 Error to charge jury that it need determine only whether negligence was cause of removal of kidney when evidence suggested kidney was not viable
- § 3:85 Charge as to successive liability based on diminished life expectancy when patient first saw defendant not proper because wrongful death was indivisible injury
- § 3:86 Charge as to foreseeability and intervening cause: Proper
- § 3:87 Error to charge that the defendant’s malpractice must be “the” cause rather than “a” cause
- § 3:88 Proper not to charge liability of original tortfeasor for subsequent injury due to malpractice absent factual basis for charge

CHAPTER 4. VICARIOUS LIABILITY

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 4:1 Comment
- § 4:2 Historical background: Charitable immunity doctrine and respondeat superior
- § 4:3 Attending physicians
- § 4:4 Contract physicians
- § 4:5 Ostensible agency and control-in-fact

II. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF HOSPITALS

A. GENERAL RULE

- § 4:6 General rule: Hospitals are not responsible for malpractice of private attending physicians and independent contractors

B. OSTENSIBLE AGENCY

- § 4:7 Hospital is vicariously liable under ostensible agency for malpractice of private attending physicians treating hospital (service) patients
1. Generally
- § 4:8 Hospital liable under ostensible agency as a matter of law

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:9 Hospital may as a matter of fact be liable under ostensible agency for emergency room care provided by assigned or on-call physicians
- § 4:10 Hospital may be liable under ostensible agency for a nonemergency treating physician assigned to the patient or on call
- § 4:11 Hospital may be liable under ostensible agency to patient treated by doctors held out as its employees in advertising campaign
- § 4:12 Hospital failed to establish absence of issues of fact concerning ostensible agency
- § 4:13 Plaintiff directed by personal physician to go to emergency room: Treated by private physician in emergency room: Hospital not vicariously liable
- § 4:14 Hospital not responsible under ostensible agency for physicians responding to an emergency page
- § 4:15 No ostensible agency where the patient came to be treated by the doctor via a referral
- § 4:16 Hospital liability for anesthesiologists, radiologists, pathologists, and emergency room doctors under ostensible agency
- 2. Exception to General Rule: Agency in Fact or Control
- § 4:17 Exception to general rule: Control-in-fact
- § 4:18 Issues of fact exist concerning agency in fact or control
- § 4:19 No agency in fact as a matter of law
- § 4:20 Hospital liability for anesthesiologists, radiologists, pathologists, and emergency room doctors under control/agency-in-fact
- § 4:21 Mere referral by hospital for treatment elsewhere does not result in vicarious liability
- 3. Hospital Vicarious Liability for Anesthesiologists, Radiologists, Pathologists, and Emergency Room Doctors
- § 4:22 Hospital vicarious liability for anesthesiologists, radiologists, pathologists, and emergency room doctors
- a. Anesthesiologists
- § 4:23 Hospital may be liable for the anesthesiologist under ostensible agency
- § 4:24 Hospital vicariously liable for anesthesiologist as a matter of law
- § 4:25 As a matter of law hospital not vicariously liable for the anesthesiologist

b. Radiologists

- § 4:26 Issue of fact as to hospital's vicarious liability for radiologist
- § 4:27 Hospital failure to produce its bylaws and contract with radiology group permits inference of control
- § 4:28 As a matter of law hospital not vicariously liable for radiologist

c. Pathologists

- § 4:29 Issues of fact as to hospital vicarious liability for pathologists
- § 4:30 As a matter of law hospital not liable for pathologist
- § 4:31 Hospital vicariously liable for pathologist as a matter of law

d. Emergency Room Doctors

- § 4:32 Hospital vicariously liable as a matter of law for emergency room doctors
- § 4:33 Issue of fact as to hospital liability for emergency room physician
- § 4:34 As a matter of law hospital not liable for malpractice of emergency room physician

e. Nondelegable Duties

- § 4:35 Emergency room, anesthesiology, radiology, and pathology services are all integral to a hospital and must by law be provided by hospitals, such that they are nondelegable duties for which hospitals must remain liable
- § 4:36 Emergency room, anesthesia, radiology, and pathology are integral services to hospitals
- § 4:37 The public policy of the state of New York as to the hospital and the regulations promulgated thereunder render the services of emergency room physicians, anesthesiologists, radiologists, and pathologists nondelegable duties
- § 4:38 General public policy
- § 4:39 Regulatory provisions concerning hospital management contracts
- § 4:40 Specific regulatory provisions regarding anesthesiology services in hospitals
- § 4:41 Specific regulatory provisions regarding radiology services in hospitals
- § 4:42 Specific regulatory provisions regarding pathology services in hospitals
- § 4:43 Specific regulatory provisions regarding emergency services in hospitals

f. Clearly Contraindicated Treatment

- § 4:44 Hospitals may be liable for orders of or treatments by attending physicians that are clearly contraindicated

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:45 Hospital not responsible for following orders of attending physician which are not clearly contraindicated but may be liable for the independent acts of negligence of its staff
- § 4:46 Hospital not liable where resident exercised no medical judgment and followed attending physician's orders which were not clearly contraindicated
- § 4:47 Lead surgeon has ultimate responsibility and could not be compelled to follow resident's advice
 - g. Hospital Vicarious Liability Where Action Dismissed/Discontinued Against Doctor
- § 4:48 Hospital not vicariously liable if underlying claim against negligent physician or employee is time-barred
- § 4:49 Hospital vicariously liable for its employees where the action was dismissed against the employees for lack of jurisdiction
- § 4:50 Hospital may be vicariously liable even though action against the employee was settled and/or discontinued on the merits with prejudice
- § 4:51 Statutory defense available to physician but not hospital does not preclude hospital's vicarious liability
 - h. Hospital Liability for Employee's Sexual Relations with Plaintiff
- § 4:52 Hospital not responsible for employee's sexual relations with plaintiff
 - i. Hospital Liability for Blood Services by Independent Contractors or Providers
- § 4:53 Hospital not responsible for negligence of a blood bank
- § 4:54 Hospital not vicariously liable for independent contracting transfusionist

III. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF PHYSICIANS

1. GENERALLY

- § 4:55 Physician generally not liable for another physician absent joint action or control

2. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF THE HOSPITAL FOR THE DIRECTOR OR CHIEF OF SERVICE; VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF THE DIRECTOR OR CHIEF OF SERVICE

- § 4:56 Hospital/director/chief: Not liable
- § 4:57 Hospital/director/chief may be held vicariously liable

3. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF OWNER OF CLINIC

§ 4:58 Owner of clinic may be vicariously liable

**4. VICARIOUS LIABILITY FOR REFERRALS,
COVERING ARRANGEMENTS AND JOINT
TREATMENT**

§ 4:59 Liability for referrals, covering arrangements and joint treatment

§ 4:60 No physician vicarious liability for covering physician

§ 4:61 Referring physician not liable for properly made referral, but liable for independent negligence or joint treatment

§ 4:62 Physician may be held liable for joint treatment that was negligently rendered

**5. VICARIOUS LIABILITY BASED ON
SUPERVISION OF OTHERS**

§ 4:63 Vicarious liability of physician based upon supervision of others

**6. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF PHYSICIAN BASED
ON INHERENTLY DANGEROUS WORK**

§ 4:64 Vicarious liability of physician based upon inherently dangerous work

**7. VICARIOUS LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF
STRANGER**

§ 4:65 Physician not vicariously liable for stranger who examined patient in examination room the physician had rented

**IV. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF HEALTH
MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS**

§ 4:66 Comment

§ 4:67 HMO may be liable for negligence of physician

§ 4:68 HMO not liable for negligence of its physician

**V. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF A MEDICAL
GROUPS, CLINIC AND CENTERS**

**A. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF CLINICS/CENTERS/
GROUPS AND THEIR OWNERS**

§ 4:69 Clinics/centers/groups and their owners may be held

TABLE OF CONTENTS

vicariously liable for malpractice of doctors practicing at clinic

B. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF UNION CLINICS

- § 4:70 Union clinics may be held liable for malpractice of treating physician
- § 4:71 Union clinic may be liable under ostensible agency even though malpractice was committed by union-assigned doctor at a hospital rather than at the clinic

VI. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF EMERGENCY ROOM STAFFING COMPANY

- § 4:72 Companies that staff emergency rooms

VII. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF SHAREHOLDERS/OFFICERS/CO-EMPLOYEES

- § 4:73 No vicarious liability for shareholders/officers/co-employees

VIII. GENERAL PARTNERS AND PARTICIPANTS IN JOINT VENTURE ARE JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY LIABLE FOR ACTS OF ONE ANOTHER

- § 4:74 Comment
- § 4:75 Partners are vicariously liable for each other
- § 4:76 Joint venturers are united in interest and liable for each other's torts

IX. VICARIOUS LIABILITY BY GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES

- § 4:77 State responsible for independent contractor-surgeon assigned by it to operate on plaintiff
- § 4:78 City not vicariously liable for private ambulance

X. VICARIOUS LIABILITY JURY CHARGE

- § 4:79 Jury charges regarding vicarious liability: Erroneous

XI. APPORTIONMENT OF FAULT

- § 4:80 No apportionment of fault required between vicariously liable defendant and actively liable defendant

CHAPTER 5. CONTRIBUTION AND INDEMNIFICATION

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 5:1 Generally
- § 5:2 Role played by contribution and CPLR Article 16: Litigation among defendants
- § 5:3 Impact of settling defendants and nonparties
- § 5:4 Third-party practice and procedure

II. CPLR ARTICLE 16 LIMITATION ON LIABILITY FOR NONECONOMIC LOSS

A. APPORTIONMENT UNDER ARTICLE 16

- § 5:5 Statutes
- § 5:6 Comment
- § 5:7 CPLR 1603: Affirmative defense, bill of particulars required?
- § 5:8 Negligent defendant is entitled to Article 16 apportionment with intentional tortfeasor
- § 5:9 Defendant apportioned responsibility less than 50%: Liability limited to apportionment
- § 5:10 Breach of nondelegable duty by defendant does not bar apportionment between entities for whom it is not vicariously liable
- § 5:11 Third-party defendant liable to the extent of apportionment
- § 5:12 Failure of plaintiff to plead and prove exception under CPLR 1601(1): Recovery limited: Complaint should be amended
- § 5:13 CPLR 1602 limited to exceptions contained therein: Court cannot create new exception
- § 5:14 Bankruptcy does not preclude apportionment between defendant and bankrupt
- § 5:15 Inability to sue state because of subject-matter jurisdiction does not preclude personal jurisdiction and apportionment against the state
- § 5:16 Inability to sue co-employees because of workers' compensation does not preclude apportionment against them
- § 5:17 No apportionment is required under Article 16 where physician is vicariously liable for resident

B. MOTIONS TO AMEND COMPLAINT TO PLEAD EXCEPTIONS TO ARTICLE 16

- § 5:18 Motion to amend granted
- § 5:19 Motion to amend complaint to plead exception to Article 16 denied

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C. JURY CHARGE AS TO APPORTIONMENT

- § 5:20 Failure to charge apportionment: Error
- § 5:21 Failure to charge exception to apportionment: Not error

D. WAIVER OF RIGHT TO ARTICLE 16 APPORTIONMENT AS TO CODEFENDANT

- § 5:22 Waiver of right to Article 16 apportionment as to codefendant
by failure to oppose codefendant's summary judgment motion

III. CONTRIBUTION

A. THE STATUTES

1. Right to Contribution

- § 5:23 CPLR 1401
- § 5:24 CPLR 1402
- 2. Effect to Be Given a Settlement: Gen. Obl. Law
§ 15-108
- § 5:25 Effect to be given a settlement: Gen. Obl. Law § 15-108
- 3. Reducing the Verdict: CPLR 4533-b
- § 5:26 Reducing the verdict: CPLR 4533-b
- 4. Claiming Contribution or Indemnity Against
One Not Party to the Action
- § 5:27 CPLR 1007
- § 5:28 CPLR 1008
- § 5:29 CPLR 1009
- § 5:30 CPLR 1010
- 5. Claiming Contribution or Indemnity Against a
Codefendant: CPLR 3011
- § 5:31 CPLR 3011

B. CONTRIBUTION BETWEEN INDEPENDENT SUCCESSIVE TORTFEASORS

- § 5:32 Comment
- § 5:33 Limits to *Dole* contribution
- § 5:34 Article 14 as expanding *Dole*
- § 5:35 Declared preference of apportioning injuries or damages in
lieu of fault
- § 5:36 Apportioning fault after apportioning injuries

C. CONTRIBUTION AVAILABLE/UNAVAILABLE

1. Contribution Available

- § 5:37 Contribution between initial and successive tortfeasors potentially jointly and severally liable to plaintiff for the same indivisible injuries
- § 5:38 Initial tortfeasor may recover from practitioner whose subsequent malpractice aggravates injuries: Initial tortfeasor is always liable to plaintiff for both initial and aggravated injuries
- § 5:39 Apportionment among defendants liable for the same injury
- § 5:40 Plaintiff unable to sue directly one of several joint tortfeasors by reason of procedural impediment: Contribution available as between defendant and third-party defendant insulated from suit

2. Contribution Unavailable

- § 5:41 Medical practitioner aggravating injuries sustained in accident may not seek contribution from original tortfeasor: Recovery against practitioners limited to such injuries as they caused exclusive of pre-existing condition
- § 5:42 Settling tortfeasor: Waives right to contribution, not indemnity
- § 5:43 Initial tortfeasor settling with plaintiff cannot seek reimbursement against medical provider asserted to have aggravated initial injuries
- § 5:44 No contribution from parent for negligent supervision
- § 5:45 Contribution from doctor or hospital unavailable to attorneys in legal malpractice action alleging failure to timely commence medical malpractice action: Not the same injury
- § 5:46 General release does not release other tortfeasors unless the release so expressly provides
- § 5:47 Defendant, a foreign corporation filed for bankruptcy: Third party indemnification and contribution claim precluded

3. Proof of Whether Injury Is Divisible or Indivisible

- § 5:48 Proof of whether injury is divisible or indivisible

D. APPORTIONMENT OF FAULT—DAMAGES

- § 5:49 Percentage apportionment between referring physician and specialist
- § 5:50 Percentage apportionment between hospital and physicians: Against the weight of the evidence: New trial ordered or verdict reapportioned by the Appellate Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**IV. EFFECT OF SETTLEMENT BY ONE ENTITLED
TO OR LIABLE FOR CONTRIBUTION**

A. INTRODUCTION

§ 5:51 Comment

B. EFFECT OF SETTLEMENT ON PARTIES

§ 5:52 Settlement with plaintiff does not result in waiver of contribution rights where, by agreement in which all third-party defendants participate, stipulation permits contribution claims to survive

C. AGGREGATE METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT

§ 5:53 Aggregate method of apportionment

D. SETOFFS AND OFFSETS

§ 5:54 Setoff is an affirmative defense which must be pleaded

§ 5:55 Settlement by plaintiff with first tortfeasor may result in reduced recovery against tortfeasor accused of aggravating accident injuries

§ 5:56 Non-settling defendant: Entitled to bring third-party action where plaintiff discontinues action against a party defendant for no monetary consideration

§ 5:57 Non-settling defendant: Right to offset not forfeited by failure to introduce proof of settling tortfeasor's equitable share: Defendant is entitled to offset equal to settlement proceeds

§ 5:58 In determining the amount of setoff, the settlement must be reduced first before determining the amount of setoff

§ 5:59 Determining amount of offset in cases involving settlement of wrongful death and survival actions: Offset is in the amount of present value of settlement: Not future value

§ 5:60 Determining amount of offset in cases involving settlement of future damages: Offset is in the amount of present value of settlement: Not future value

§ 5:61 Hearing ordered pursuant to CPLR 4533-b to determine portion of settlement between original and successor tortfeasor

§ 5:62 Parties cannot agree to allocation which binds a nonparty defendant

§ 5:63 Setoff available in settlement between plaintiff and his employer

E. NO RIGHT TO APPORTIONMENT WHEN INDEMNIFICATION RATHER THAN CONTRIBUTION SOUGHT

- § 5:64 No right to apportionment when indemnification rather than contribution sought

V. EFFECT TO BE GIVEN JUDGMENT

- § 5:65 Payment of judgment and receipt of release: Gen. Obl. Law § 15-108(c) not applicable
- § 5:66 *Klinger* impasse and *Feldman* solution—Third-party defendant's obligation to satisfy contribution judgment does not arise until defendant pays plaintiff a sum exceeding his equitable share
- § 5:67 —Defendant pays judgment by loan for whose repayment plaintiff is principally responsible: Lender, by assignment from defendant, may seek contribution from third-party defendant but not where the third-party defendant is plaintiff's employer which action is precluded by workers' compensation
- § 5:68 Successful defendant cannot utilize judgment in his favor to defeat contribution claim by practitioner who was not party to original suit
- § 5:69 Defendant who prevails at trial and on appeal is immune from suit by codefendant who prevailed at trial but is remanded for retrial upon reversal of judgment

VI. PLEADING THE CONTRIBUTION CLAIM

- § 5:70 Third-party complaint must independently set forth a cause of action against third-party defendant
- § 5:71 Defendant must particularize his cross claim against codefendants if he intends to adduce proof which differs from proof that plaintiff will introduce at trial
- § 5:72 Claims for contribution and indemnification ought not be dismissed at pleading stage
- § 5:73 Plaintiff's action against defendant dismissed: Court converts cross claims into third-party complaints
- § 5:74 Claim for contribution or indemnification may be asserted in counterclaim
- § 5:75 The defendant is permitted to amend answer to allege setoff

VII. INDEMNIFICATION

- § 5:76 Generally
- § 5:77 Comment
- § 5:78 Hospital vicariously liable for malpractice of its servants: May claim indemnity

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:79 Pathologist and his professional corporation must indemnify hospital for malpractice committed by substitute pathologist
- § 5:80 Hospital may secure indemnification from emergency room physician despite latter's settlement with plaintiff if hospital is held vicariously liable to plaintiff for his misconduct
- § 5:81 Dual employers: Vicarious liability: Right to indemnification and/or contribution
- § 5:82 Partnership entitled to indemnification from employee nurse practitioner where partnership's liability was purely vicarious
- § 5:83 Indemnification unavailable where settlement precludes action based on settling defendants' vicarious liability

CHAPTER 6. MUNICIPAL AND QUASI-MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 6:1 Generally

II. STATUTES

A. GENERALLY

- § 6:2 Statutes as against municipal corporations
- § 6:3 New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation—Comment

B. COMPLIANCE WITH NOTICE OF CLAIM PROVISIONS AS CONDITION PRECEDENT TO SUIT

- § 6:4 Compliance with notice of claim provisions as condition precedent to suit must be pleaded in complaint: Failure to so plead is jurisdictional defect

C. SERVICE OF NOTICE OF CLAIM MUST BE ON OFFICER DESIGNATED TO RECEIVE SUCH NOTICE OR ATTORNEY WHO REPRESENTS THE CORPORATION

- § 6:5 Service of notice of claim against NYCH & H Corporation upon the Comptroller of the City of New York: Service invalid
- § 6:6 Notice of claim against NYCH & H Corporation served upon Corporation Counsel of the City of New York: Valid service
- § 6:7 Service of notice of claim against Holly Patterson Geriatric Center upon county of Nassau: Invalid
- § 6:8 Service of notice of claim on Nassau County clerk proper

- § 6:9 Letter sent to attorney for Department of Housing Preservation & Development Corporation: Sufficient service

D. ACTIONS WHERE NOTICE OF CLAIM NOT REQUIRED

- § 6:10 Fraud
§ 6:11 Infant claimant is ward of defendant municipality
§ 6:12 Action against staff physician who receives compensation

E. ACTIONS WHERE NOTICE OF CLAIM REQUIRED

1. Introduction

- § 6:13 Comment
2. Notice of Claim As Condition Precedent to Suit Against Employee Physician

- § 6:14 Comment
§ 6:15 Notice of claim required upon municipal defendant as condition precedent to suit against physician entitled to indemnity only if he receives no compensation from patient
§ 6:16 Notice of claim required upon municipal hospital as a condition precedent to suit against the physician who is entitled to indemnity under Gen. Mun. Law § 50-k if he complies therewith
§ 6:17 Gen. Mun. Law § 50-d applicable even though doctor had insurance and doctor's employer agreed to indemnify county
§ 6:18 Mother treated at county health center by employees of private hospital but delivered at hospital: No notice of claim required

F. SUFFICIENCY OF NOTICE OF CLAIM

1. Introduction

- § 6:19 Notice of claim sufficiently states claim to avoid dismissal
§ 6:20 Notice of claim sufficient to encompass cause of action for lack of informed consent

2. Amendment to Notice of Claim

- § 6:21 Notice of claim against NYCH & H Corp. for acts of one hospital insufficient/sufficient to impose liability on another NYCH & H Corp. hospital: Motion to amend notice of claim denied/granted
§ 6:22 Incorrect date in notice of claim must be corrected by motion
§ 6:23 Amendment not necessary: Claim covered in original notice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:24 Motion to amend notice of claim to allege negligence: Denied
- § 6:25 Theories of recovery: Limited by notice of claim

G. NOTICE OF CLAIM TIMELY FILED

- § 6:26 Claim filed 90 days after date of last treatment or last scheduled treatment
- § 6:27 Claim for wrongful death filed within 90 days of appointment of personal representative: Timely as to wrongful death but not as to pain and suffering claim

H. NOTICE OF CLAIM UNTIMELY FILED

- § 6:28 Notice of claim untimely filed

I. TOLLING

- § 6:29 Toll by reason of continuous treatment doctrine
- § 6:30 90-day period extended by treatment rendered at subsequent municipal hospital: Continuous treatment doctrine may apply
- § 6:31 90-day period extended by treatment at subsequent private hospital where patient directly referred: Sufficient nexus exists between the two hospitals
- § 6:32 90-day treatment not extended by treatment at subsequent private hospital
- § 6:33 CPLR 210(a) applicable: Timely application
- § 6:34 CPLR 210(a) inapplicable: Untimely application

III. FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED ON APPLICATION TO FILE A LATE NOTICE OF CLAIM

A. INTRODUCTION

- § 6:35 Comment
- § 6:36 Hospital records sufficient to give notice of essential facts
- § 6:37 Hospital records insufficient to give notice of essential facts
- § 6:38 Application to file late notice of claim must be made within limitations period

B. EXCUSE FOR DELAY IN FILING LATE NOTICE OF CLAIM

- § 6:39 Comment

C. SUFFICIENT/INSUFFICIENT EXCUSE FOR FILING A LATE NOTICE OF CLAIM

- § 6:40 Minimal delay: Motion granted

NEW YORK MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

- § 6:41 Inadequate explanation for delay: Motion denied
- § 6:42 Ignorance of statutory requirements: Not sufficient excuse for failing to serve a timely notice of claim

D. PREJUDICE

- § 6:43 Comment
- § 6:44 Prejudice not demonstrated, hospital has notice of essential facts: Motion granted
- § 6:45 Hospital is out of existence: Record is available: Physicians are available: No prejudice
- § 6:46 One doctor still employed, other doctor can be contacted: No prejudice
- § 6:47 Doctors no longer employed: Prejudice demonstrated

E. INFANCY

- § 6:48 Comment
- § 6:49 Infancy and other factors sufficient to warrant granting of motion
- § 6:50 Infancy is a factor to be considered on infant's motion for leave to serve a late notice of claim
- § 6:51 Infant receives the benefit of the 10-year statute: Not extended because of continuous treatment
- § 6:52 Infancy toll not applicable to derivative claim
- § 6:53 Guardian fails to timely serve action within one year and 90 days: CPLR 208 toll still applicable

F. MENTAL INCAPACITY

1. Statute Not Tolled

- § 6:54 Statute not tolled for post-traumatic neurosis: Plaintiff not insane within meaning of CPLR 208
- § 6:55 No showing of insanity: Notice of claim not timely filed: Dismissed

2. Statute Tolled

- § 6:56 Inability to protect legal rights and overall inability to function in society

3. Hearing Ordered to Determine if Insanity Toll Pursuant to CPLR 208 Is Applicable

- § 6:57 Hearing ordered to determine if insanity toll pursuant to CPLR 208 is applicable

G. PHYSICAL INCAPACITY

- § 6:58 Statute tolled

TABLE OF CONTENTS

H. DEATH

§ 6:59 Death

IV. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS: MUNICIPAL SUBDIVISIONS AND PUBLIC CORPORATIONS

A. GENERALLY

- § 6:60 Informed consent, conscious pain, and suffering: One year and 90 days: Wrongful death: Two years
- § 6:61 False imprisonment: One year
- § 6:62 Suit against employee of municipal corporation not timely commenced: Action dismissed
- § 6:63 Affiliate employees entitled to benefits of Gen. Mun. Law § 50-i
- § 6:64 Wrongful death: 90 days after death or appointment of administrator

B. TOLLING

- § 6:65 Toll by reason of application to file late notice of claim
- § 6:66 Toll by application to file late notice of claim: No further stay when defendant appeals from order granting motion
- § 6:67 Toll by reason of Gen. Mun. Law § 50-h(5)
- § 6:68 NYCH & H Corporation not “united in interest” with city: No toll
- § 6:69 Toll as per CPLR 210(a)

C. WRONGFUL DEATH

- § 6:70 Infancy of sole distributee tolls statute until letters of guardianship are issued or infant’s majority
- § 6:71 Infancy of intestate distributee does not toll statute where another person is available to become personal representative
- § 6:72 Toll by reason of infancy as distributee and not infancy as decedent

V. ESTOPPEL

A. ESTOPPING DEFENDANT FROM RELYING UPON LATE FILING OF NOTICE OF CLAIM OR SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

- § 6:73 Newly created, autonomous public corporation: NYCH & H Corporation may be estopped
- § 6:74 Listing of clinic in official directory: Notice to plaintiff of municipal status: No estoppel
- § 6:75 Defendant conceals from plaintiff significant finding first discovered on receipt of hospital record: Estoppel invoked

- § 6:76 Comptroller's hearing scheduled after expiration of limitations period: No estoppel
- § 6:77 Defendant did not lull plaintiff into false sense of security: No estoppel
- § 6:78 Motion to dismiss on other grounds: No waiver or estoppel
- § 6:79 Failure to raise affirmative defense: No estoppel
- § 6:80 Misleading conduct of HHC estops HHC from raising failure to serve timely notice of claim

VI. OTHER CONDITIONS TO SUIT

- § 6:81 Noncompliance with Gen. Mun. Law § 50-h—Dismissal not warranted
- § 6:82 —Dismissal warranted

VII. CLAIMS AGAINST STATE

A. GENERALLY

- § 6:83 The statutes
- § 6:84 Comment
- § 6:85 Filing a claim for wrongful death and personal injuries before executor or administrator appointed: Jurisdictionally defective
- § 6:86 Notice of claim on the Attorney General was mailed but not by certified mail as required by statute: Claim dismissed
- § 6:87 Service by regular mail, not certified mail with return receipt requested: Jurisdictionally defective
- § 6:88 Service of a notice of claim upon the attorney general by registered mail, return receipt requested rather than certified mail, return receipt requested: Jurisdictionally defective
- § 6:89 Ad damnum clause not required in notice of claim
- § 6:90 Unverified claim and claim that fails to set forth the nature of the claim, when it arose, where it arose, and the amount claimed: Claim jurisdictionally defective

B. APPLICATION FOR LATE NOTICES OF CLAIM

- § 6:91 Comment
- § 6:92 90-day requirement of filing a notice of claim under Court of Claims Act § 10(3) is extended by the continuous treatment doctrine
- § 6:93 Merit and reasonable excuse established/not established: Late notice of claim application denied/granted
- § 6:94 Notice of intention to file a late notice of claim: Not permitted if the action is barred by the statute of limitations
- § 6:95 Malpractice action barred by 2½-year statute: Claim that

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- hospital failed to provide, hire, and staff competent medical personnel or promulgate rules and regulations: Negligence: three-year statute applicable
- § 6:96 Notice of claim for wrongful death must be filed within 90 days after the appointment of personal representative: Survival action for personal injuries must be filed within 90 days after accrual of such claim
- § 6:97 Unexcused, inordinate delay: Application denied
- § 6:98 Two-year tolling provisions under Court of Claims Act § 10(5) applicable to personal representative of deceased infant
- § 6:99 Claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress: Not available against a government entity: Late notice of claim denied
- § 6:100 Application to file late notice of claim in medical malpractice action by ordinary mail is proper

VIII. JURISDICTION

- § 6:101 Action commenced against state hospital: Exclusive jurisdiction in Court of Claims
- § 6:102 Actions against physicians employed by state hospital may be brought in Supreme Court
- § 6:103 Plaintiff erroneously brings claim in Supreme Court: No toll

CHAPTER 7. JURISDICTION

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 7:1 Comment

II. SUMMONS

A. GENERALLY

- § 7:2 The statutes
- § 7:3 Comment
- § 7:4 Nature of action not stated: Jurisdictionally defective: Statute of limitations not extended
- § 7:5 Nature of action stated: Jurisdictionally correct
- § 7:6 Failure to state amount to be recovered in case of default: Mere irregularity
- § 7:7 Jurisdictional defect not objected to: Any defect was waived

B. AMOUNT TO BE RECOVERED CANNOT BE STATED IN PERSONAL INJURY AND WRONGFUL DEATH ACTION

- § 7:8 Comment

**C. SUMMONS: INCORRECTLY NAMED,
IMPROPER OR UNKNOWN PARTIES**

- § 7:9 The statute
- § 7:10 Complaint must describe the unknown party
- § 7:11 Plaintiff failed to conduct diligent inquiry as to actual identity of defendant: Action dismissed
- § 7:12 Misnomer: A correctable defect
- § 7:13 Action dismissed for failure to appoint administrator: Second action proper

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SUMMONS

- § 7:14 Service of supplemental summons without leave of court is null and void unless waived by newly added party
- § 7:15 Filing supplemental summons and complaint tolls the action: Failure to file jurisdictional defect
- § 7:16 Failure to object to improper joinder: Participation in litigation: Waived/not waived
- § 7:17 Parties can be joined by stipulation or by leave of court
- § 7:18 Supreme Court is without authority to add a new party in the absence of a formal motion or stipulation by all parties

III. PURCHASING AN INDEX NUMBER

- § 7:19 The statute
- § 7:20 Comment
- § 7:21 Commencing an action before purchasing an index number: Correctable defect
- § 7:22 Article 78 petition was deemed received by county clerk who received the fee and issued appropriate index number even though the papers were returned to the petitioner
- § 7:23 Action commenced after notice of claim granted: New index number required but waived
- § 7:24 Failure to purchase second index number: Waived
- § 7:25 Pre-discovery motion and subsequent personal injury action: New index number not required

**IV. SERVICE OF PROCESS UPON A NATURAL
PERSON**

A. GENERALLY

- § 7:26 Statute
- § 7:27 Comment

B. IN-HAND DELIVERY: CPLR 308(1)

- § 7:28 Comment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:29 Service upon third person in presence of defendant at defendant's direction: Valid
- § 7:30 Service upon wrong individual but in immediate presence of defendant valid: Not valid if defendant not present
- § 7:31 Defendant avoids service: Process left in defendant's vicinity: Valid service
- § 7:32 Process server not intentionally deceived: Service invalid
- § 7:33 Service upon physician's nurse, medical assistant, receptionist, or secretary invalid
- § 7:34 Service upon hospital administrator: Invalid

C. DUE DILIGENCE IN ATTEMPTING SERVICE UNDER CPLR 308(1) IS REQUIRED BEFORE RESORTING TO SERVICE UNDER CPLR 308(2) AND THEN CPLR 308(4)

- § 7:35 Comment
- § 7:36 Due diligence was demonstrated before service under CPLR 308(4)
- § 7:37 Due diligence at personal service: Not demonstrated

D. SERVICE UPON A PERSON OF SUITABLE AGE AND DISCRETION UNDER CPLR 308(2)

- § 7:38 Upon doorman/security guard of defendant's residence: Valid
- § 7:39 Upon doctor's billing service: Valid
- § 7:40 Service upon hospital administrator/employee: Valid
- § 7:41 Service upon hospital administrator/employee: Invalid
- § 7:42 Service at office other than defendant's actual place of business: Invalid
- § 7:43 Service at office defendant holds out as actual place of business: Valid
- § 7:44 Service upon defendant's children: Invalid
- § 7:45 Service upon executive secretary of partnership: Valid service on individual defendant and partnership
- § 7:46 Service upon office manager: Invalid service on individual defendant

V. SERVICE UPON AGENT: CPLR 308(3)

- § 7:47 Service upon agent
- § 7:48 Service on common-law wife at home where they resided: Valid

VI. SERVICE BY “NAIL AND MAIL”: CPLR 308(4)

A. Availability of “Nail and Mail”

- § 7:49 Service could have been made under CPLR 308(2): CPLR 308(4) service unavailable

B. “Nailing”

- § 7:50 “Nailing” on front door of building where defendant has clearly marked office at side door: Insufficient
- § 7:51 Slipping summons under door not sufficient “nailing”: Must use nail, tack, tape, rubber band or other device
- § 7:52 Rolling up pleading and leaving in handle of storm door: Not sufficient
- § 7:53 Wedging summons between locked screen door and inner door: Not mailing
- § 7:54 Slipping summons between screen door and door jam: Insufficient nailing
- § 7:55 Nailing must be affixed to actual place of business or actual residence: Former residence insufficient

**VII. MAILING REQUIREMENT: SUBDIVISIONS
CPLR 308(2) AND CPLR 308(4)**

- § 7:56 Comment
- § 7:57 Summons mailed to incorrect and incomplete address: Service invalid
- § 7:58 Incorrect address or zip code: Mail virtually certain to arrive: Service valid
- § 7:59 Hearing required to determine validity of service if it is argued summons and complaint are virtually certain to arrive despite incorrect address
- § 7:60 Summons mailed to address at which defendant has not resided for several years: Service invalid
- § 7:61 Defendant fails to update address with department of licensing: Service of designated address: Valid
- § 7:62 Summons mailed to doctor’s actual place of business: Envelope does not bear legend “personal and confidential”: Service invalid
- § 7:63 Summons mailed to defendant’s last known residence by certified mail, return receipt requested: Service valid
- § 7:64 Delivery must be made to actual dwelling or place of business: CPLR 308(2) and CPLR 308(4)

VIII. EXPEDIENT SERVICE: CPLR 308(5)

- § 7:65 Comment
- § 7:66 Condition precedent to expedient service, i.e., service impracticable not satisfied: Order invalid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:67 Personal service impracticable: Condition precedent to expedient service satisfied: Order valid
- § 7:68 Condition precedent to expedient service is impracticability: Do not need to demonstrate due diligence for service to be found valid

IX. SERVICE OF PROCESS UPON A PARTNERSHIP

- § 7:69 Statute
- § 7:70 Comment
- § 7:71 Service upon a partner or former partner is service on the partnership
- § 7:72 Service on corporate partner is service on a partnership
- § 7:73 Service upon a partnership employee: Proper service on the partnership
- § 7:74 Defendant not named in summons as partner: Judgment entered against defendant for tort committed by his partner: Invalid
- § 7:75 Service on administrative assistant, executive secretary or receptionist of partnership: Improper

X. SERVICE UPON A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

- § 7:76 The statute
- § 7:77 Comment
- § 7:78 Service on one limited partner sufficient service against limited partnership

XI. SERVICE UPON A CORPORATION

1. Generally

- § 7:79 Comment
- § 7:80 Statutes
- § 7:81 Affidavit of service is prima facie proof of service: Mere denial of service is insufficient to rebut service

2. Service Upon Corporation: Invalid

- § 7:82 Service on “Joe Castro” not service on managing agent
- § 7:83 Service upon attorney or insurance company: Not service on corporation
- § 7:84 Service on hospital administrator valid to confer jurisdiction over hospital but not over individual defendant: Two summonses must be served
- § 7:85 Service on receptionist in professional building: Not service on corporation
- § 7:86 Service on telephone operator: Insufficient

NEW YORK MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

- § 7:87 Service on administrative assistant: Insufficient
- § 7:88 Service on executive secretary of “wrong entity”: Insufficient
- § 7:89 Service upon superintendent of insurance is service on insurance company
- § 7:90 Personal service upon assistant town attorney insufficient to effect service on town
- § 7:91 Service upon school nurse: Insufficient
- § 7:92 Service on an unauthorized foreign corporation
- § 7:93 Service under Business Corporation Law § 307: Valid
- § 7:94 Service upon a public corporation
- § 7:95 Traverse hearing required

XII. PERSONAL SERVICE UPON LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES

- § 7:96 The statute
- § 7:97 Process server’s affidavit is presumption of service: Denial insufficient to rebut presumption

XIII. PERSONAL SERVICE BY MAIL AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

- § 7:98 Comment
- § 7:99 Statute
- § 7:100 Failure to comply with specific requirements of 312-a renders service invalid

XIV. PERSONAL SERVICE WITHOUT THE STATE GIVING PERSONAL JURISDICTION

A. GENERALLY

- § 7:101 The statute
- § 7:102 Comment
- § 7:103 Service upon principal of professional corporation: Service without the state

B. SERVICE UNDER CPLR 313

- § 7:104 Service: Valid/invalid
- § 7:105 Service under CPLR 313 on defendants in a foreign country confirms personal jurisdiction: Foreign country’s service requirements need not be satisfied in the absence of treaties or international agreements supplanting CPLR 313

XV. LONG-ARM JURISDICTION: NONRESIDENTS SUBJECT TO SUIT IN THIS STATE

- § 7:106 Comment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:107 Statute
- § 7:108 Plaintiff bears the burden of proof that jurisdiction is conferred upon the defendant pursuant to the long-arm statute: CPLR 302(a)
- § 7:109 Prescription of drugs for New York resident by physician in Massachusetts: Insufficient jurisdictional predicate
- § 7:110 Vermont doctor treating patient in Vermont not subject to New York jurisdiction
- § 7:111 Service on foreign country's mission to United Nations: Invalid
- § 7:112 Service on Connecticut hospital: Invalid
- § 7:113 Jurisdiction over Ohio laboratory performing biopsy for New York patient
- § 7:114 Jurisdiction over nondomiciliary decedent's estate for tort committed by decedent in New York: Proper
- § 7:115 Jurisdiction over New Jersey health care provider: Not proper
- § 7:116 Soliciting business in New York and transporting patients to New Jersey office: Confers jurisdiction under CPLR 302

XVI. EXTENSION OF TIME TO SERVE PROCESS WHEN PROCESS NOT SERVED WITHIN 120 DAYS AFTER FILING

- § 7:117 Statutes
- § 7:118 Comment
- § 7:119 Extension of time for good cause: Granted
- § 7:120 No good cause demonstrated: Interest of justice demonstrated: Extension granted
- § 7:121 Extension granted: Plaintiff does not know identity of one of the defendants
- § 7:122 No good cause demonstrated: Interest of justice not demonstrated: Extension denied
- § 7:123 Requirements of CPLR 306-b can be waived by defendants by appearing and defending without raising the objection

XVII. PROOF OF SERVICE

A. GENERALLY

- § 7:124 The statute
- § 7:125 Comment
- § 7:126 Process server's affidavit of service constitutes prima facie evidence of service
- § 7:127 Mere denial of receipt of service insufficient to rebut prima facie proof of service
- § 7:128 Process server's affidavit: Sufficient

B. TRAVERSE HEARING

- § 7:129 Plaintiff has the burden of proof of service at a traverse hearing
- § 7:130 Service sustained
- § 7:131 Service not sustained

**XVIII. PRESERVING AND LITIGATING
OBJECTION TO JURISDICTION**

A. GENERALLY

- § 7:132 Comment
- § 7:133 Statute
- § 7:134 Defense waived where defendant fails to timely move to dismiss
- § 7:135 Stipulation extending time to answer: Waiver/No waiver of jurisdiction defect
- § 7:136 Unsigned stipulation: No waiver of jurisdictional defect

**B. PROCEDURE TO DISMISS ACTION FOR LACK
OF JURISDICTION**

- § 7:137 Prior to joinder of issue: Objection to jurisdiction must be raised by motion to dismiss under CPLR 3211
- § 7:138 Plaintiff awarded discovery of jurisdictional facts
- § 7:139 Consenting to jurisdiction

**XIX. JURISDICTION OVER NONRESIDENT
VOLUNTARILY IN STATE TO PARTICIPATE
IN LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

- § 7:140 Nonresident voluntarily in New York to participate in a legal proceeding

XX. JURISDICTION UPON DEATH OF PARTY

- § 7:141 A party's death deprives the court of jurisdiction until a substitute is named: CPLR 1021

**XXI. JURISDICTION THROUGH ADJUNCT
GUARDIANSHIP PROCEEDINGS**

- § 7:142 Action properly commenced by adjunct guardianship proceedings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER 8. VENUE AND FORUM NON
CONVENIENS**

I. INTRODUCTION

§ 8:1 Generally

II. STATUTES

§ 8:2 CPLR 503

§ 8:3 CPLR 510

§ 8:4 CPLR 511(a), (b)

§ 8:5 CPLR 327

§ 8:6 Additional rules and statutes

III. VENUE PROPER/IMPROPER

A. VENUE PROPER

§ 8:7 Residence is where a party stays for some time with intent to stay for some length of time

§ 8:8 Venue proper where plaintiff's residence was not contrived

§ 8:9 Plaintiff's removal from state or county after action properly commenced does not render venue improper

§ 8:10 Venue of wrongful death action properly placed in county where administratrix appointed

§ 8:11 Venue for suit against physician properly placed where defendant has an office

§ 8:12 Venue based on residence of "nominal" defendant not improper

§ 8:13 Venue in Bronx County was proper against St. Barnabas Hospital

§ 8:14 Venue properly placed in county where corporation has its principal office

B. VENUE IMPROPER

§ 8:15 Forum shopping

§ 8:16 Apartments that are not primary residence cannot provide basis for venue under CPLR 503(a)

§ 8:17 Venue changed: Action discontinued or dismissed against sole party upon whose residence venue was based

§ 8:18 Removal of co-plaintiff whose residence was sole basis for venue within county: Venue changed

§ 8:19 Venue changed to location of defendant's principal office, where act of malpractice occurred

§ 8:20 Venue changed to location of defendants' residences, where act of malpractice occurred

- § 8:21 Guardian ad litem's residence does not control venue
- § 8:22 By choosing improper venue plaintiff forfeits right to select venue

C. TIMELY/NOT TIMELY MOTION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE

- § 8:23 Plaintiff serves timely response to defendant's demand for change of venue: Defendant's motion must be made in county where action is pending
- § 8:24 Defendants' failure to timely move for change of venue: Fatal to their efforts to change venue on grounds of improper venue
- § 8:25 Defendant's failure to comply with requirements of CPLR 511 excused

IV. REQUEST FOR CHANGE BASED ON CONVENIENCE OF WITNESSES

- § 8:26 Transitory actions and convenience of witnesses
- § 8:27 Motion to transfer venue based on convenience of witnesses: Granted
- § 8:28 Motion to transfer venue on convenience of witnesses: Denied
- § 8:29 Motion for change of venue not timely made

V. INABILITY TO OBTAIN AN IMPARTIAL TRIAL

- § 8:30 Transfer denied for failure to establish impartial trial could not be had
- § 8:31 Plaintiff is a sitting justice: To avoid the appearance of impropriety: Venue changed
- § 8:32 Motion to voluntarily discontinue to bring action in county where a substantial verdict was returned against defendant granted

VI. ACTIONS AGAINST PUBLIC AUTHORITIES/ MUNICIPALITIES

A. CONFLICTING VENUE PROVISIONS

- § 8:33 Consolidation of actions against New York City and New York City Health & Hospital Corporation: The statutory provisions for venue pertaining to New York City Health & Hospital Corporation take priority
- § 8:34 Consolidated actions against two municipal defendants: Venue properly transferred to county where first action was commenced
- § 8:35 Action commenced against city and county: Venue determined based upon the convenience of witnesses

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**B. VENUE IN THIRD PARTY ACTION
COMMENCED AGAINST COUNTY**

- § 8:36 Third-party action commenced against county: Transfer properly denied

C. VENUE IN ACTION AGAINST VILLAGE

- § 8:37 Venue against village is in county in which it is situated

**D. VENUE IN ACTION AGAINST NEW YORK CITY
HOUSING AUTHORITY**

- § 8:38 Venue in an action against New York City housing authority is in county where it has its principal office

VII. FORUM NON CONVENIENS

- § 8:39 Comment
- § 8:40 Plaintiffs are all residents of foreign country: Choice-of-law principles mandate application of foreign law: Suit dismissed
- § 8:41 Brain-damaged infant plaintiff resident of and in attendance at special schools in New York: Jurisdiction retained
- § 8:42 Defendant practices in Texas where plaintiff, a New York resident, sought his treatment: Suit dismissed
- § 8:43 New York defendant counterclaims in malpractice against Florida plaintiff: Jurisdiction over counterclaim retained
- § 8:44 Actions against drug company commenced by nonresidents: Dismissed: No substantial nexus with New York

VIII. PARTIES' AGREEMENT AS TO FORUM

- § 8:45 Parties' agreement as to forum is valid and enforceable