

Amirov v. Turtle Bay Tavern Corp.

Smith, State Reporter Court Decisions Resources About



Home All Court Decisions Decisions

Amirov v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp.

2026 NY Slip Op 03055
May 14, 2026
Appellate Division, First 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.

Mikael Amirov et al., Plaintiffs-Respondents,
v
Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. et al, Defendants-Appellants.

Decided and Entered: May 14, 2026
Index No. 23467/19|Appeal No. 6642|Case No. 2025-04813|
Before: Manzanet-Daniels, J.P., Kennedy, Friedman, Gesmer, Rosado, JJ.

Ondrovic & Platek, PLLC, White Plains (John Notoris of counsel), for appellants.
Leav & Steinberg, L.L.P., New York (Philip Schultze of counsel), for respondents.

[*1]
Order, Supreme Court,

Bronx County (Alison Y. Tuitt, J.), entered May 30, 2025, which granted plaintiffs' motion to strike defendants' answer pursuant to CPLR 3126, unanimously reversed, on the law, without costs, the motion denied and defendants' answer reinstated.

The motion court improvidently exercised its discretion in striking defendants' answer for failing to produce a witness with knowledge of the facts concerning an alleged assault at defendants' premises and defendant's internal policies and procedures related to security and the service of alcohol to intoxicated patrons.

Since the business closed in 2018, the individuals with knowledge of the foregoing issues were no longer employed by defendant or within its control (*see Lee v 13th St. Entertainment LLC*, 161 AD3d 631, 632 [1st Dept 2018]).

Moreover, five months before the parties appeared for a preliminary conference on October 16, 2019, defendants disclosed the names and addresses of 17 former employees, nine of whom worked on the night of the alleged assault: seven security guards, one manager, and one bartender.

Plaintiff could have subpoenaed those employees as nonparty witnesses (*see* *id.*).

Plaintiff's position that defendants concealed the identity of a former manager of the business who assisted them in preparing responses to plaintiffs' interrogatories is unavailing. Plaintiff's interrogatories did not seek any other information. It was not until over four years later that plaintiff further inquired about this individual in a letter to opposing counsel and defendant's counsel promptly responded disclosing her last known address.

Based on the foregoing, the record does not establish that defendants' conduct was willful, contumacious or in bad faith (<i>see e.g. Lee</i>, 161 AD3d at 632; <i>Catarine v Beth Israel Med. Ctr.</i>, 290 AD2d 213, 215 [1st Dept 2002]).</p> <p>However, on this record, defendant will not "maintain the option of simply producing [additional witnesses] at trial to testify [on] their behalf if at a future time they should obtain control over [them]" without, at a minimum, first "allowing [plaintiff] to complete [a] pre-trial deposition" of those witnesses (<i>see e.g.</i> <i>Vera v Beth Israel Medical Center</i>, 175 AD2d 716 [1st Dept 1991]).

The production of additional witnesses will also be subject to any preclusionary orders the trial court deems necessary at that time (*Center Sheet Metal v Cannon Design, Inc.*, 185 AD3d 507, 507-508 [1st Dept 2020]).

THIS CONSTITUTES THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT.

ENTERED: May 14, 2026

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.

Amirov v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. - 2026 NY Slip Op 03055

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

Amirov v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp.

2026 NY Slip Op 03055

May 14, 2026

Appellate Division, First 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.

Mikael Amirov et al., Plaintiffs-Respondents,

v

Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. et al, Defendants-Appellants.

Decided and Entered: May 14, 2026

Index No. 23467/19|Appeal No. 6642|Case No. 2025-04813|

Before: Manzanet-Daniels, J.P., Kennedy, Friedman, Gesmer, Rosado, JJ.

Ondrovic & Platek, PLLC, White Plains (John Notoris of counsel), for appellants.

Leav & Steinberg, L.L.P., New York (Philip Schultze of counsel), for respondents.

[*1]

Order, Supreme Court, Bronx County (Alison Y. Tuitt, J.), entered May 30, 2025, which granted plaintiffs' motion to strike defendants' answer pursuant to CPLR 3126, unanimously reversed, on the law, without costs, the motion denied and defendants' answer reinstated.

The motion court improvidently exercised its discretion in striking defendants' answer for failing to produce a witness with knowledge of the facts concerning an alleged assault at defendants' premises and defendant's internal policies and procedures related to security and the service of alcohol to intoxicated patrons.

Since the business closed in 2018, the individuals with knowledge of the foregoing issues were no longer employed by defendant or within its control (*see* Lee v 13th St. Entertainment LLC, 161 AD3d 631, 632 [1st Dept 2018]).

Moreover, five months before the parties appeared for a preliminary conference on October 16, 2019, defendants disclosed the names and addresses of 17 former employees, nine of whom worked on the night of the alleged assault: seven security guards, one manager, and one bartender.

Plaintiff could have subpoenaed those employees as nonparty witnesses (*see* *id.*).

Plaintiff's position that defendants concealed the identity of a former manager of the

business who assisted them in preparing responses to plaintiffs' interrogatories is unavailing. Plaintiff's interrogatories did not seek any other information. It was not until over four years later that plaintiff further inquired about this individual in a letter to opposing counsel and defendant's counsel promptly responded disclosing her last known address.

Based on the foregoing, the record does not establish that defendants' conduct was willful, contumacious or in bad faith (*see e.g. Lee*, 161 AD3d at 632; *Catarine v Beth Israel Med. Ctr.*, 290 AD2d 213, 215 [1st Dept 2002]). However, on this record, defendant will not "maintain the option of simply producing [additional witnesses] at trial to testify [on] their behalf if at a future time they should obtain control over [them]" without, at a minimum, first "allowing [plaintiff] to complete [a] pre-trial deposition" of those witnesses (*see e.g. Vera v Beth Israel Medical Center*, 175 AD2d 716 [1st Dept 1991]).

The production of additional witnesses will also be subject to any preclusionary orders the trial court deems necessary at that time (*Center Sheet Metal v Cannon Design, Inc.*, 185 AD3d 507, 507-508 [1st Dept 2020]).

THIS CONSTITUTES THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT.

ENTERED: May 14, 2026

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.

Amirov v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. - 2026 NY Slip Op 03055 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 Amirov v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. 2026 NY Slip Op 03055 May 14, 2026 Appellate Division, First 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. Mikael Amirov et al., Plaintiffs-Respondents, v Turtle Bay Tavern Corp. et al, Defendants-Appellants. Decided and Entered: May 14, 2026 Index No. 23467/19|Appeal No. 6642|Case No. 2025-04813| Before: Manzanet-Daniels, J.P., Kennedy, Friedman, Gesmer, Rosado, JJ. Ondrovic & Platek, PLLC, White Plains (John Notoris of counsel), for appellants.

Leav & Steinberg, L.L.P., New York (Philip Schultze of counsel), for respondents. [*1] Order, Supreme Court, Bronx County (Alison Y. Tuitt, J.), entered May 30, 2025, which granted plaintiffs' motion to strike defendants' answer pursuant to CPLR 3126, unanimously reversed, on the law, without costs, the motion denied and defendants' answer reinstated.

The motion court improvidently exercised its discretion in striking defendants' answer for failing to produce a witness with knowledge of the facts concerning an alleged assault at defendants' premises and defendant's internal policies and procedures related to security and the service of alcohol to intoxicated patrons. Since the business closed in 2018, the individuals with knowledge of the foregoing issues were no longer employed by defendant or within its control (see *Lee v 13th St. Entertainment LLC*, 161 AD3d 631, 632 [1st Dept 2018]).

Moreover, five months before the parties appeared for a preliminary conference on October 16, 2019, defendants disclosed the names and addresses of 17 former employees, nine of whom worked on the night of the alleged assault: seven security guards, one manager, and one bartender. Plaintiff could have subpoenaed those employees as nonparty witnesses (see *id.*).

Plaintiff's position that defendants concealed the identity of a former manager of the business who assisted them in preparing responses to plaintiffs' interrogatories is unavailing. Plaintiff's interrogatories did not seek any other information. It was not until over four years later that plaintiff further inquired about this individual in a letter to opposing counsel and defendant's counsel promptly responded disclosing her last known address.

Based on the foregoing, the record does not establish that defendants' conduct was willful, contumacious or in bad faith (see e.g. *Lee*, 161 AD3d at 632; *Catarine v Beth Israel Med. Ctr.*, 290 AD2d 213, 215 [1st Dept 2002]).

However, on this record, defendant will not "maintain the option of simply producing [additional witnesses] at trial to testify [on] their behalf if at a future time they should obtain control over [them]" without, at a minimum, first "allowing [plaintiff] to complete [a] pre-trial deposition" of those witnesses (see e.g. *Vera v Beth Israel Medical Center*, 175 AD2d 716 [1st Dept 1991]).

The production of additional witnesses will also be subject to any preclusionary orders the trial court deems necessary at that time (*Center Sheet Metal v Cannon Design, Inc.*, 185 AD3d 507, 507-508 [1st Dept 2020]). THIS CONSTITUTES THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT. ENTERED: May 14, 2026 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.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/new-york-supreme-court-appellate-division-first-department-supreme-court-of-the-state-of-new-york-ap/2026/amirov-v-turtle-bay-tavern-corp-29r2gukn>