Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

All Decisions

Housing Court Decisions Project

2023-04-04

Pitkin Place LLC v. Belcher

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

Recommended Citation

"Pitkin Place LLC v. Belcher" (2023). *All Decisions*. 945. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/housing_court_all/945

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.

Pitkin Place LLC v Belcher

2023 NY Slip Op 50268(U) [78 Misc 3d 1220(A)]

Decided on April 4, 2023

Civil Court Of The City Of New York, Kings County

Jimenez, J.

Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431.

This opinion is uncorrected and will not be published in the printed Official Reports.

Decided on April 4, 2023

Civil Court of the City of New York, Kings County

Pitkin Place LLC, Petitioner,

against

Freddy Belcher and Deyen Key, Respondents.

Index No. 305000/22

JBS Law PC Attn: Jonathan Barry Schreier, Esq. 545 Broadway 4th Floor Brooklyn, New York 11206 jbs@jbslawpc.com

Attorneys for Petitioner — Pitkin Place LLC CAMBA Legal Services, Inc. Attn: Milad Momeni, Esq. 20 Snyder Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11226 miladm@camba.org

Attorneys for Respondent — Freddy Belcher

Sergio Jimenez, J.

Recitation, as required by CPLR § 2219(a), of the papers considered in the review of petitioner's motion seeking to vacate the ERAP statute and any other relief as the court may find appropriate:

Papers Numbered

Notice of Motion with affidavits and exhibits 1 (NYSCEF No.6-9) Affirmation in Opposition and exhibits 2 (NYSCEF #11-13) Affirmation in Reply 3 (NYSCEF #14)

The instant motion seeks to vacate the ERAP stay. It is undisputed that the application remains pending. The parties, both represented by counsel, fully briefed the issue, and the court heard argument on March 20, 2023. Upon hearing argument, the court reserved decision.

Petitioner's Motion

Petitioner seeks to vacate the ERAP stay stating that the respondent, being a subsidized housing tenant has a low priority and that the amount of time the application has been pending is prejudicial to the petitioner. Respondent opposes stating that a determination has not yet been made.

After argument, motion is denied. The ERAP statute has no subsidized housing exemption. The court finds petitioner's argument that OTDA's website provides a blanket determination for all subsidized housing to be unavailing. Respondent has a pending ERAP application; the statute mandates a stay until a "determination of eligibility is made" (L 2021, ch 56, part BB, subpart A, §8). The court, when presented by tenants with the informational email of an approval, does not take the quasi-legal advice being given to be binding upon the court. Likewise, it will not accept OTDA's general non-specific (as to this respondent's eligibility) informational website to either be binding on this court or a "determination" for the purposes of statutory interpretation. In the same way that it is not the providence of OTDA to make judicial findings of statutory applicability, it is not within the purview of the court to make eligibility determinations (see <u>Savy Props. 26 Corp. v James, 76 Misc 3d 1214</u>[A][Civ Ct Kings County, 2022]. As such, respondent is entitled to a court stay of this proceeding until there is an eligibility determination on the application or if circumstances change.

Conclusion

Petitioner's motion to vacate the ERAP stay is denied for the reasons set forth above.

Proceeding remains on the ERAP administrative calendar. This constitutes the Decision and Order of the Court.

Dated: April 4, 2023 Brooklyn, New York Sergio Jimenez, JHC

Return to Decision List