

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,  
THIRD DEPARTMENT

Matter of Davis v. Gia Quinto Masonry

2026 N.Y. Slip Op. 02486 (N.Y. Ct. App. 2026) · No. CV-24-2025 · Decided April 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Third Department affirmed a Workers' Compensation Board decision establishing that a brick mason's bilateral hand, wrist, and knee conditions constituted an occupational disease. The court held that substantial medical evidence supported the Board's determination despite conflicting medical testimony. It also upheld a penalty imposed on the employer's carrier for unilaterally initiating a third deposition of the claimant's treating physician while an administrative appeal was pending.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Corcoran, J.; Clark, J.P.; Aarons, J.; Ceresia, J.; McShan, J.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| JURISDICTION          | New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DECIDED               | April 23, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DOCKET                | CV-24-2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| DISPOSITION           | affirmed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The employer and its workers' compensation carrier appealed from a Workers' Compensation Board decision that established claimant's occupational-disease claim and imposed a reduced penalty for instituting a frivolous proceeding.                                                                                     |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The Board's determination concerning the presence and classification of an occupational disease is reviewed for substantial evidence and will not be disturbed even if the record contains evidence supporting a contrary result. The Board's resolution of conflicting medical evidence is entitled to great deference. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | published                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| PARTIES               | Gia Quinto Masonry et al., employer and workers' compensation carrier v. Samuel Davis, claimant, Workers' Compensation Board                                                                                                                                                                                             |

## TOPICS

workers compensation

administrative law

standard of review

appellate procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

workers' compensation

employment law

administrative law

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether substantial evidence supported the Workers' Compensation Board's determination that claimant's bilateral hand, wrist, and knee conditions constituted an occupational disease causally related to his work as a brick mason.
2. Whether the Workers' Compensation Board properly imposed a penalty on the carrier for initiating a frivolous proceeding by unilaterally conducting a third medical deposition while an administrative appeal was pending.

## HOLDINGS

1. The Board's determination that claimant sustained an occupational disease was supported by substantial evidence and would not be disturbed.
2. The Board properly determined that a penalty was warranted because the carrier unilaterally subpoenaed the treating physician for a third deposition without a directive from the Workers' Compensation Law Judge while its administrative appeal was pending.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“To be entitled to workers' compensation benefits for an occupational disease, a claimant must establish a recognizable link between his or her condition and a distinctive feature of his or her occupation through the submission of competent medical evidence” ([\*1])*

*“The Board's decision regarding the presence and classification of a medical condition — i.e., an occupational disease — is a factual consideration that will not be disturbed if it is supported by substantial evidence” ([\*1])*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Samuel Davis worked as a brick mason for more than 25 years, 35 to 40 hours per week, performing repetitive lifting, carrying, bending, squatting, troweling, hammering, climbing, and use of vibrating tools. He claimed that repetitive work-related trauma caused conditions affecting both hands and wrists and both knees. His treating physician, Robert Hecht, related the conditions to his occupational duties, while the carrier's consultant disputed causation. While the carrier's administrative appeal was pending, it unilaterally subpoenaed Hecht for a third deposition, leading to a penalty proceeding.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A Workers' Compensation Law Judge established claimant's claim for an occupational disease involving his bilateral hands, wrists, and knees and imposed a \$2,500 penalty on the carrier for initiating a frivolous proceeding. The Workers' Compensation Board affirmed the claim determination but reduced the penalty to \$500. The carrier appealed to the Appellate Division, which affirmed the Board's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Matter of Velez v Eger Health Care & Rehab Ctr., 217 AD3d 1095, 1096 [3d Dept 2023]
- Matter of Kretunski v Citywide Envtl. Servs. LLC, 233 AD3d 1218, 1218-1219 [3d Dept 2024]
- Matter of Powers v State Material Mason Supply, 202 AD3d 1265, 1266 [3d Dept 2022], lv denied 38 NY3d 914 [2022]
- Matter of Morgan v Kinray, Inc., 226 AD3d 1288, 1290 [3d Dept 2024]
- Matter of Manka v Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., 123 AD3d 1172, 1173 [3d Dept 2014], lv denied 25 NY3d 909 [2015]
- Matter of Freyta v Calvin Maintenance Inc., 220 AD3d 1036, 1038 [3d Dept 2023]
- Matter of Camby v System Frgt., Inc., 105 AD3d 1237, 1238 [3d Dept 2013]
- Matter of Scott v Bimbo Bakeries USA, Inc., 171 AD3d 1421, 1423 [3d Dept 2019]
- Matter of Garcia v MCI Interiors, Inc., 158 AD3d 907, 908 [3d Dept 2018]

OPINION

Matter of Davis v. Gia Quinto Masonry 2026 NY Slip Op 02486  
PER CURIAM.

Matter of Davis v Gia Quinto Masonry - 2026 NY Slip Op 02486 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

# Matter of Davis v Gia Quinto Masonry

2026 NY Slip Op 02486

April 23, 2026

Appellate Division, Third 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.

In the Matter of the Claim of Samuel Davis, Claimant,

v

Gia Quinto Masonry et al., Appellants, et al., Respondents. Workers' Compensation Board, Respondent.

Decided and Entered: April 23, 2026

CV-24-2025 Calendar Date: March 24, 2026 Before: Clark, J.P., Aarons, Ceresia, Mcshan And Corcoran, JJ.

Lois Law Firm, LLC, New York City (Addison O'Donnell of counsel), for appellants.

Letitia James, Attorney General, New York City (Marjorie S. Leff of counsel), for Workers' Compensation Board, respondent.

[\*1] Corcoran, J.

Appeal from a decision of the Workers' Compensation Board, filed November 29, 2024, which, among other things, ruled that claimant sustained an occupational disease.

Claimant, employed as a brick mason for over 25 years, filed a claim for workers' compensation benefits for an occupational disease for bilateral hands/wrists and bilateral knees, asserting that such conditions were caused by repetitive work-related trauma. Following a hearing and various medical depositions, a Workers' Compensation Law Judge (hereinafter WCLJ) established the claim for an occupational disease involving claimant's bilateral hands, wrists and knees. The employer and its workers' compensation carrier (hereinafter collectively referred to as the carrier) appealed the WCLJ's decision.

While that administrative appeal was pending and over the objection of claimant's counsel, the carrier unilaterally subpoenaed and conducted a third medical deposition of claimant's treating physician, Robert Hecht. Thereafter, claimant filed a Request for Further Action and, at the ensuing hearing, sought the imposition of a penalty against the carrier for (1) the frivolous nature of the proceedings to depose Hecht for a third time without direction or approval from the Workers' Compensation Board while an administrative appeal was pending, and (2) for deposing Hecht on issues not yet relevant or in existence (i.e., claimant's degree of disability where there had been no lost time). At the conclusion of the hearing, the WCLJ imposed a \$2,500 penalty against the carrier for initiating a frivolous proceeding. The carrier administratively appealed that decision. In a combined decision filed November 29, 2024, the Board affirmed the establishment of the occupational disease claim but modified the penalty against the carrier by reducing it to \$500. The carrier appeals.

We affirm. "To be entitled to workers' compensation benefits for an occupational disease, a claimant must establish a recognizable link between his or her condition and a distinctive feature of his or her occupation through the submission of competent medical evidence" (*Matter of Velez v Eger Health Care & Rehab Ctr.*, 217 AD3d 1095, 1096 [3d Dept 2023] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted]; *accord Matter of Kretunski v Citywide Envtl. Servs. LLC*, 233 AD3d 1218, 1218-1219 [3d Dept 2024]). "The Board's decision regarding the presence and classification of a medical condition — i.e., an occupational disease — is a factual consideration that will not be disturbed if it is supported by substantial evidence" (*Matter of Powers v State Material Mason Supply*, 202 AD3d 1265, 1266 [3d Dept 2022] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted], *lv denied* 38 NY3d 914 [2022]), "even where there is record evidence that could support a contrary result" (*Matter of Morgan v Kinray, Inc.*, 226 AD3d 1288, 1290 [3d Dept 2024] [internal quotation marks and citation omitted]).

We are unpersuaded by the carrier's contention that Hecht only [\*2] had a generalized understanding of claimant's specific job duties, which was insufficient to demonstrate

a recognizable link between claimant's job and his bilateral hand/wrist and bilateral knee conditions. When he sought medical treatment from Hecht in September 2022, claimant relayed that he worked as a brick mason for over 25 years, working 35 to 40 hours a week. He reported that his job duties required repetitive lifting, carrying heavy boxes, bending, squatting, troweling, hammering, climbing ladders and scaffolding, and using vibrating power tools, chipping guns and wet saws.<sup>FN1</sup> Based upon his examinations of claimant, claimant's denial of any relevant prior injuries and review of diagnostic tests, including MRIs revealing broad radial tears of the medial meniscus in both knees and positive Tinsel tests for carpal tunnel syndrome in both wrists, Hecht opined that claimant's bilateral hand/wrist and bilateral knee conditions were consistent with and causally related to the repetitive nature of claimant's occupational duties. In crediting Hecht's testimony, the Board noted, and the record supports, that Hecht was aware of claimant's specific repetitive duties as a brick mason and the length of time he was engaged in such duties. Although the carrier presented a conflicting medical opinion from its consultant who found no causal link between the nature of claimant's work and his bilateral hand/wrist and bilateral knee conditions and generally attributed them to various degenerative and other factors, the Board's assessment and resolution of the conflicting medical evidence is entitled to great deference (*see* *Matter of Manka v Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.*, 123 AD3d 1172, 1173 [3d Dept 2014], *lv denied* 25 NY3d 909 [2015]). Given the nature of claimant's work and reported duties, and deferring to the Board's resolution of the conflicting medical opinions, we find that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision that claimant sustained an occupational disease and, as such, it will not be disturbed (*see e.g. Matter of Freyta v Calvin Maintenance Inc.*, 220 AD3d 1036, 1038 [3d Dept 2023]; *Matter of Camby v System Frgt., Inc.*, 105 AD3d 1237, 1238 [3d Dept 2013]; *see also Matter of Scott v Bimbo Bakeries USA, Inc.*, 171 AD3d 1421, 1423 [3d Dept 2019]; *Matter of Garcia v MCI Interiors, Inc.*, 158 AD3d 907, 908 [3d Dept 2018]).

Turning to the carrier's challenge to the penalty, there is no dispute that the carrier unilaterally and without a directive from the WCLJ subpoenaed Hecht for a third deposition while its administrative appeal was pending. Accordingly, we find no basis to disturb the Board's determination that a penalty for instituting a frivolous proceeding was warranted (*see* Workers' Compensation Law § 114-a [3] [i]). To the extent not specifically addressed, the carrier's remaining contentions are without merit.

Clark, J.P., Aarons, Ceresia and McShan, JJ., concur.

ORDERED that the decision is affirmed, without costs.

---

## Footnotes

Footnote 1

Testimony at the hearing reflects that claimant would set between 100 and 300 bricks/stones a day in building a wall.

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</p> <p>Albany, NY 12207</p> <p>Phone: (518) 453-6900</p> </div> </footer>  
</div> <div> <p>Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with  
them.</p> </div> </div>

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/new-york-supreme-court-appellate-division-third-department-supreme-court-of-the-state-of-new-york-ap/2026/matter-of-davis-v-gia-quinto-masonry-gqvkv80>