Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

All Decisions

Housing Court Decisions Project

2022-12-27

Islam v. Rodriguez

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/housing_court_all

Recommended Citation

"Islam v. Rodriguez" (2022). *All Decisions*. 769. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/housing_court_all/769

This Housing Court Decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Housing Court Decisions Project at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Decisions by an authorized administrator of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.

Islam v Rodriguez

2022 NY Slip Op 34472(U)

December 27, 2022

Civil Court of the City of New York, Bronx County

Docket Number: Index No. 314955/2022

Judge: Krzysztof Lach

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(U), are republished from various New York State and local government sources, including the New York State Unified Court System's eCourts Service.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

FILED: BRONX CIVIL COURT - L&T 12/27/2022 02:10 PMPEX NO. LT-314955-22/BX [HO]

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 14 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/27/2022

CIVIL COURT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF BRONX: HOUSING PART

JWELLI A. ISLAM

Petitioner

Index No. 314955/2022

- against -

DECISION/ORDER

MARISOL RODRIGUEZ MICHAEL WIGLEY VICTOR MOLINA JOHN DOE JANE DOE

Respondents,

Recitation, as required by CPLR § 2219 (a), of the papers considered in the review of the motion.

| PAPERS | NUMBERED |
|--|---------------------------|
| Respondent's Notice of Motion; Affirmation in Support; Memorandum | 1 |
| of Law; & Exhibits | (NYSCEF Docs. #'s 7 - 11) |
| Petitioner's Opposition | 2 |
| 1 etitioner's Opposition | (NYSCEF Doc. # 12) |
| | 3 |
| Respondent's Affirmation in Reply | (NYSCEF Doc. # 13) |

Upon the foregoing cited papers, the Decision and Order on Respondent's Notice of Motion is as follows:

The instant holdover proceeding is predicated upon a "Notice to Quit, Vacate, & Surrender" dated December 19, 2019 ("the predicate notice"). It was served upon the named Respondents on December 28, 2019. Petitioner filed the instant Petition on May 26, 2022 or some twenty-nine months after the predicate notice was served. Prior to the commencement of this action, the Petitioner had commenced an identical summary holdover proceeding against the very same Respondents herein

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 14 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/27/2022

under index number LT-004800-20/BX ("prior holdover proceeding"). The prior holdover was dismissed without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction. The predicate notice herein was the very same predicate noticed used in the prior holdover proceeding. The question now before the Court is whether the Petitioner can re-use the predicate notice after the prior holdover proceeding was dismissed. The Court rejects Petitioner's ability to do so.

Since the prior holdover proceeding was dismissed, the "Notice to Quit, Vacate, & Surrender" upon which it was predicated cannot be revived or re-used to support the new action herein (Kaycee W. 113th St. Corp. v Diakoff, 160 AD2d 573 [1st Dept 1990]). Here, given the length of time that transpired between service of the predicate notice and the commencement of the instant proceeding, Respondents was entitled to a degree of finality when the prior holdover proceeding was dismissed. To hold otherwise would permit a state of ambiguity which would subject the Respondent to the whims of the Petitioner who may decide (or may not for that matter) to seek possession of the subject premises. The Court is aware of a line of cases which would permit the reuse of a predicate notice in a subsequent proceeding where the subsequent proceeding was commenced prior to the discontinuance of the prior proceeding, and where the tenant has been caused no discernible prejudice (e.g. 145 East 16th Street LLC v Spencer, 36 Misc 3d 128 [A] [App Term 1st Dept 2012]; 890 Park LLC v. Rosenfeld 34 Misc.3d 130[A] [App Term Dept 2011]). The facts herein do not permit the Court to follow these line of cases.

Accordingly, the instant holdover proceeding is dismissed without prejudice.

Dated: Bronx, New York

December 27, 2022

HON. KRZYSZTOF LACH Judge, Housing Court