YSCEF DOC: NO. 88

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

HON. WILLIAM PERRY		PARI	CPARI 2;	
	Ju	stice		
		X INDEX NO.	150599/2017	
SUAREZ, GABRIEL		MOTION DAT	TE 09/17/2021	
	Plaintiff,	MOTION SEC). NO. 003	
-v-	•	\$1.		
ADES, YVES		DECISION + ORDER ON		
	Defendant.		MOTION	
The following e-filed documents,	listed by NVSCEE doors	X	100) 74 75 76 77 70	
79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87	listed by N 1 SOEF docuit	ent nomber (Monon i	103) (4, 75, 75, 77, 78 ₁	
were read on this motion to/for	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	MISCELLANE	ous .	

The court held a jury trial in this trip and fall action on June 8, 9, 14, and 15, 2021. The jury returned a verdict finding that Plaintiff Gabriel Suarez was 60% at fault, while Defendant Yves Ades was 40% at fault, and awarded Plaintiff \$50,000.00 for past pain and suffering, plus \$200,000.00 for future pain and suffering (for an expected 24.1 years). The jury also found that Plaintiff would require a future surgery, which added another \$37,500.00 to the award, a figure which had been stipulated to by the parties. Because of the degree of comparative negligence, the \$287,500.00 award was reduced to \$115,000.00.

After the verdict was read and the jury was discharged, Plaintiff alleges that the jurors approached counsel and indicated that they had actually intended for Plaintiff to receive the full \$287,500.00 amount, rather than the \$115,000.00 after apportionment.

Now, Plaintiff moves for the court to either 1) direct a judgment for damages as the jury intended, pursuant to CPLR 4404[a] or; 2) set aside the verdict and direct a new trial on the issue of damages "as the jury was not charged to disregard their finding of fault when awarding damages," or 3) award a new trial on the issue of damages because the award was inadequate.

(NYSCEF Doc No. 75, Pl.'s Memo.) In support, Plaintiff submits affidavits of the 6 jurors.
(NYSCEF Doc No. 79.) The motion is fully submitted and is granted to the extent that a new trial on the issue of damages is directed.

A new trial on damages is warranted because "[t]he verdict sheet was, on its face, unclear and confusing, and thus, created an issue as to the precise amount the jury intended to award the plaintiff." (McStocker v Kolment; 160 AD2d 980, 981 [2d Dept 1990].) The parties did not request, and as a result the court did not provide, an instruction to the jury that it was to disregard the apportionment of fault in calculating the amount of damages owed to Plaintiff. This "error was so fundamental as to preclude a proper consideration of the issue of damages ... [and thus] a new trial limited to the issue of damages is appropriate." (Best v Swan Group Ltd Partnership, 81 AD3d 1344 [4th Dept 2011].) However, consideration of the jury affidavits is improper, as "the jury's error in awarding damages was not clerical or ministerial in nature[.]" (Flanagan v Southside Hosp., 251 AD2d 447, 448 [2d Dept 1998]; Best, 81 AD3d at 1344.) Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion sequence 003 is granted to the extent that a new trial on the issue of damages is directed.

A. A. (11) (1. C. 45)		The Conference of the conference of the Market of the Conference o
istuditaistitusta ajatajais on on sajatai son junia, salatai salatai salatai salatai salatai salatai salatai s	e alterial de la company d	ma ina finita na mana ao
3/24/2022		and planting on the control of the control of the control of
ythysigham i in Olz412UZZa	gargina and a significant and	The street Harding of Late 1 and The Company of the
A SAME		
DATE.		WILLIAM PERRY, J.S.C.
	Mango into interfer explicit graph of Garden Management (1997) and in the	the same of particular than the same of th
antina ina india dia ara-ara-ara-ara-ara-ara-ara-ara-ara-ar	Laboratoria del Production del la companya del	dita lkinggan - waxaningi ito access to within
CHECK ONE:	CASE DISPOSED	U Dalou Pater piopogramou
ALAL.	CACE DISTORED TO THE TIME TO T	X NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
agagi kakangkanakan kakanakan merupah menungan berana dana di Alimbanggi di <mark>Perdasa</mark>		The state of the s
Philipping and the state of the complete of	GRANTED DENIED	X GRANTED IN PART OTHER
	OLOUITED .	X GRANTED IN PART
. And the second	and the state of t	transfer to the contract of th
APPLICATION:	SETTLE ORDER	SUBMIT ORDER
and the state of the same of t		1 GODBIT ORDER
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN	FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT REFERENCE
	***************************************	[[] in a partie to the twick of the first of the
inglightighted by the transfer of the contract		The Tip tink, is a feet as a supplicitable position of the state of t