

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,
SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT**

Ramjattan v. Auringer

Ramjattan, 2026 NY Slip Op 03011 (Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division Second
Judicial Department 2026) · No. 2024-12528 · Decided May 13, 2026


OPINION

Ramjattan v. Auringer 2026 NY Slip Op 03011

PER CURIAM.

Ramjattan v Auringer - 2026 NY Slip Op 03011 [skip to main content](#)

It appears you are using Adblock. Please disable Adblock to best experience our website.




Law Reporting Bureau Home Page

Thomas J.K. Smith, State Reporter

Court Decisions

Resources About



Home

All Court Decisions

Decisions

Ramjattan v Auringer

2026 NY Slip Op 03011

May 13, 2026

Appellate Division, Second Department

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

This decision is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports.

Chris Ramjattan, respondent,

v

Austin Auringer, et al., appellants.

Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department

Decided on May 13, 2026

2024-12528, (Index No. 709859/21)

Francesca E. Connolly, J.P.

Cheryl E. Chambers

Helen Voutsinas

Elena Goldberg Velazquez, JJ.

Kahana & Feld LLP, New York, NY (John F. Watkins of counsel), for appellants.

Ikhilov & Associates (Beth S. Gereg, Smithtown, NY, of counsel), for respondent.

DECISION & ORDER

In an action to recover damages for personal injuries, the defendants appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Queens County (Phillip Hom, J.), entered September 27, 2024. The order, insofar as appealed from, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence.

ORDERED that the order is reversed insofar as appealed from, on the law, with costs, and that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence is denied.

The plaintiff commenced this action against the defendants to recover damages for personal injuries that he allegedly sustained when his vehicle collided with the defendants' vehicle at an intersection in Queens. The plaintiff moved, inter alia, for summary judgment on the issue of liability and

dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, contending that the defendants' negligence was the sole proximate cause of the accident. In an order entered September 27, 2024, the Supreme Court, among other things, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence.

"[T]he issue of a plaintiff's comparative negligence may be decided in the context of a summary judgment motion where the plaintiff moves for summary judgment dismissing a defendant's affirmative defense alleging comparative negligence and culpable conduct on the part of the plaintiff" (*Sapienza v Harrison*, 191 AD3d 1028, 1029; *see* *Fischetti v Simonovsky*, 227 AD3d 670, 671; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC*, 222 AD3d 851, 852).

Here, the plaintiff failed to establish his prima facie entitlement to judgment as a matter of law dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, since the plaintiff's affidavit did not eliminate all triable issues of fact as to whether he was free from comparative negligence (*see* *Lu Yan Li v Yong Hua Zhen*, 232 AD3d at 873; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC*, 222 AD3d at 852; *Policart v Wheels LT*, 221 AD3d at 922).

Accordingly, the Supreme Court should have denied that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence without regard to the sufficiency of the defendants' opposition papers (*see* *Winegrad v New York Univ. Med. Ctr.*, 64 NY2d 851, 853).

CONNOLLY, J.P., CHAMBERS, VOUTSINAS and GOLDBERG VELAZQUEZ, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Darrell M. Joseph

Clerk of the Court

Court Decisions

All Court Decisions Official Reports Service Bound Volumes Decision Search

Resources

RSS Feeds Style Manual Citation Tools Opinion Formatting & Privacy Guidelines Opinion Selection Criteria Legal Research Portal Site Index

About

About the Law Reporting Bureau About our Operations Contact Us Twitter

Quick Contact Info

17 Lodge Street

Albany, NY 12207

Phone: (518) 453-6900


Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.

PER CURIAM.

Ramjattan v Auringer - 2026 NY Slip Op 03011

skip to main content

It appears you are using Adblock. Please disable Adblock to best experience our website.



Law Reporting Bureau Home Page

Law Reporting Bureau

Thomas J.K. Smith, State Reporter

Court Decisions

Resources

About



Home

All Court Decisions

Decisions

Ramjattan v Auringer

2026 NY Slip Op 03011

May 13, 2026

Appellate Division, Second Department

Published by New

York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431.

This decision is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports.

Chris Ramjattan, respondent,

v

Austin Auringer, et al., appellants.

Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department

Decided on May 13, 2026

2024-12528, (Index No. 709859/21)

Francesca E. Connolly, J.P.

Cheryl E. Chambers

Helen Voutsinas

Elena Goldberg Velazquez, JJ.

Kahana & Feld LLP, New York, NY (John F. Watkins of counsel), for appellants.

Ikhilov & Associates (Beth S. Gereg, Smithtown, NY, of counsel), for respondent.

DECISION & ORDER

In an action to recover damages for personal injuries, the defendants appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Queens County (Phillip Hom, J.), entered September 27, 2024. The order, insofar as appealed from, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence.

ORDERED that the order is reversed insofar as appealed from, on the law, with costs, and that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence is denied.

The plaintiff commenced this action against the defendants to recover damages for personal injuries that he allegedly sustained when his vehicle collided with the defendants' vehicle at an intersection in Queens. The plaintiff moved, inter alia, for summary judgment on the issue of liability and dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, contending that the defendants' negligence was the sole proximate cause of the accident. In an order entered September 27, 2024, the Supreme Court, among other things, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence.

"[T]he issue of a plaintiff's comparative negligence may be decided in the context of a summary judgment motion where the plaintiff moves for summary judgment dismissing a defendant's affirmative defense alleging comparative negligence and culpable conduct on the part of the plaintiff" (*Sapienza v Harrison*, 191 AD3d 1028, 1029; *see* *Fischetti v Simonovsky*, 227 AD3d 670, 671; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC*, 222 AD3d 851, 852).

Here, the plaintiff failed to establish his prima facie entitlement to judgment as a matter of law dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, since the plaintiff's affidavit did not eliminate all triable issues of fact as to whether he was free from comparative negligence (*see* *Lu Yan Li v Yong Hua Zhen*, 232 AD3d at 873; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC*, 222 AD3d at 852; *Policart v Wheels LT*, 221 AD3d at 922).

Accordingly, the Supreme Court should have denied that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence without regard to the sufficiency of the defendants' opposition papers (*see* *Winegrad v New York Univ. Med. Ctr.*, 64 NY2d 851, 853).

CONNOLLY, J.P., CHAMBERS, VOUTSINAS and

GOLDBERG VELAZQUEZ, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Darrell M. Joseph

Clerk of the Court

Court Decisions

All Court Decisions

Official Reports

Service Bound Volumes

Decision Search

Resources

RSS Feeds

Style Manual

Citation Tools

Opinion Formatting & Privacy Guidelines

Opinion Selection Criteria

Legal Research Portal

Site Index

About

About the Law Reporting Bureau

About our Operations

Contact Us

Twitter

Quick Contact Info

17 Lodge Street

Albany, NY 12207

Phone: (518) 453-6900

Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.

PER CURIAM.

Ramjattan v Auringer - 2026 NY Slip Op 03011 skip to main content It appears you are using Adblock. Please disable Adblock to best experience our website. Law Reporting Bureau Thomas J.K. Smith, State Reporter Court Decisions Resources About Home All Court Decisions Decisions Ramjattan v Auringer 2026 NY Slip Op 03011 May 13, 2026 Appellate Division, Second Department Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431. This decision is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports. Chris Ramjattan, respondent, v Austin Auringer, et al., appellants. Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department Decided on May 13, 2026 2024-12528, (Index No. 709859/21) Francesca E. Connolly, J.P. Cheryl E. Chambers Helen Voutsinas Elena Goldberg Velazquez, JJ. Kahana & Feld LLP, New York, NY (John F. Watkins of counsel), for appellants. Ikhilov & Associates (Beth S. Gereg, Smithtown, NY, of counsel), for respondent. [*1] DECISION & ORDER In an action to recover damages for personal injuries, the defendants appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Queens County (Phillip Hom, J.), entered September 27, 2024. The order, insofar as appealed from, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence. ORDERED that the order is reversed insofar as appealed from, on the law, with costs, and that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence is denied. The plaintiff commenced this action against the defendants to recover damages for personal injuries that he allegedly sustained when his vehicle collided with the defendants' vehicle at an intersection in Queens. The plaintiff moved, inter alia, for summary judgment on the issue of liability and dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, contending that the defendants' negligence was the sole proximate cause of the accident. In an order entered September 27, 2024, the Supreme Court, among other things, granted that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence. "[T]he issue of a plaintiff's comparative negligence may be decided in the context of a summary judgment motion where the plaintiff moves for summary judgment dismissing a defendant's affirmative defense alleging

comparative negligence and culpable conduct on the part of the plaintiff" (*Sapienza v Harrison* , 191 AD3d 1028, 1029; see *Fischetti v Simonovsky* , 227 AD3d 670, 671; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC* , 222 AD3d 851, 852). Here, the plaintiff failed to establish his prima facie entitlement to judgment as a matter of law dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging comparative negligence, since the plaintiff's affidavit did not eliminate all triable issues of fact as to whether he was free from comparative negligence (see *Lu Yan Li v Yong Hua Zhen* , 232 AD3d at 873; *Karim v Proline Rental, LLC* , 222 AD3d at 852; *Policart v Wheels LT* , 221 AD3d at 922). Accordingly, the Supreme Court should have denied that branch of the plaintiff's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the defendants' affirmative defenses alleging [*2] comparative negligence without regard to the sufficiency of the defendants' opposition papers (see *Winegrad v New York Univ. Med. Ctr.* , 64 NY2d 851, 853). CONNOLLY, J.P., CHAMBERS, VOUTSINAS and GOLDBERG VELAZQUEZ, JJ., concur. ENTER: Darrell M. Joseph Clerk of the Court Court Decisions All Court Decisions Official Reports Service Bound Volumes Decision Search Resources RSS Feeds Style Manual Citation Tools Opinion Formatting & Privacy Guidelines Opinion Selection Criteria Legal Research Portal Site Index About About the Law Reporting Bureau About our Operations Contact Us Twitter Quick Contact Info 17 Lodge Street Albany, NY 12207 Phone: (518) 453-6900 Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.