

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

Gordon v. Triumph Constr. Corp.

Gordon, 2026 NY Slip Op 00581 (Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York First Department 2026) · No. Index No. 656523/22; Appeal No. 5769; Case No. 2025-00122 · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, First Department, affirmed the denial of Triumph Construction Corp.'s motion to dismiss a breach of contract claim brought by workers employed under public works contracts. The court held that the workers could pursue a third-party contract claim for underpayment against the general contractor and were not required to exhaust the administrative remedy under Labor Law § 220(3)(a).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Manzanet-Daniels, J.P.; González, J.; Shulman, J.; Pitt-Burke, J.; Chan, J.
JURISDICTION	New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	Index No. 656523/22; Appeal No. 5769; Case No. 2025-00122
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed from an order denying its motion under CPLR 3211(a)(7) to dismiss plaintiffs' breach-of-contract cause of action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the denial of a CPLR 3211(a)(7) motion to dismiss.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and precedential New York Appellate Division opinion
PARTIES	Triumph Construction Corp. v. Javon Gordon et al.

TOPICS

- breach of contract
- construction law
- motions to dismiss
- wage and hour
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

construction law

contracts

civil procedure

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether workers employed under public works contracts may assert a third-party breach-of-contract claim against the general contractor for underpayment in addition to pursuing an administrative remedy under Labor Law § 220(3)(a).
2. Whether exhaustion of administrative remedies is required before pursuing that breach-of-contract claim.
3. Whether plaintiffs' first cause of action for breach of contract was sufficiently pleaded to survive a CPLR 3211(a)(7) motion to dismiss.

HOLDINGS

1. Workers employed pursuant to public works contracts have both an administrative remedy under Labor Law § 220(3)(a) and a third-party right to assert a breach-of-contract claim for underpayment against the general contractor.
2. Exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required before plaintiffs pursue their third-party breach-of-contract claim for underpayment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As workers employed pursuant to public works contracts, plaintiffs have both an administrative remedy under Labor Law § 220(3)(a) and a third-party right to assert a breach of contract claim for underpayment against the general contractor” (at 1)

“Thus, exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs were workers employed pursuant to public works contracts. They alleged that they were underpaid and asserted a breach-of-contract claim against the general contractor. Triumph argued that the claim should be dismissed, apparently in part because plaintiffs had not exhausted administrative remedies under Labor Law § 220(3)(a).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs sued Triumph Construction Corp. and others, alleging underpayment under public works contracts. The Supreme Court, New York County, denied Triumph's motion to dismiss the first cause of action for breach of contract. The First Department unanimously affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Wroble v. Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Engineering of N.Y., P.C., 166 A.D.3d 520, 521 (1st Dep't 2018)
- Santana v. San Mateo Construction Corp., 234 A.D.3d 562, 563 (1st Dep't 2025)
- Nawrocki v. Proto Construction & Development Corp., 82 A.D.3d 534, 536 (1st Dep't 2011)
- Van Osten v. Huicatao Corp., 2024 NY Slip Op 34728(U) (Sup. Ct., Queens County 2024)
- McMillan v. Out-look Safety LLC, 241 A.D.3d 1162, 1162 (1st Dep't 2025)
- Herman v. Judlau Contracting, Inc., 243 A.D.3d 441, 442 (1st Dep't 2025)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Gordon v Triumph Constr. Corp. (2026 NY Slip Op 00581) Gordon v Triumph Constr. Corp. 2026 NY Slip Op 00581 Decided on February 05, 2026 Appellate Division, First Department Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431. This opinion is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports. Decided and Entered: February 05, 2026 Before: Manzanet-Daniels, J.P., González, Shulman, Pitt-Burke, Chan, JJ. Index No. 656523/22|Appeal No. 5769|Case No. 2025-00122| [*1]Javon Gordon et al., Plaintiffs-Respondents, v Triumph Construction Corp., Defendant-Appellant, Cone Heads Ltd., et al., Defendants.

Cole Schotz P.C., New York (Courtney Gabrielle Hindin of counsel), for appellant. Pelton Graham LLC, New York (Brent E. Pelton of counsel), for respondents. Order, Supreme Court, New York County (Lori S. Sattler, J.), entered on November 27, 2024, which denied defendant Triumph Construction Corp.'s motion pursuant to CPLR 3211(a)(7) to dismiss plaintiffs' first cause of action for breach of contract, unanimously affirmed, with costs.

The motion court correctly denied Triumph's motion to dismiss. As workers employed pursuant to public works contracts, plaintiffs have both an administrative remedy under Labor Law § 220(3) (a) and a third-party right to assert a breach of contract claim for underpayment against the general contractor (see Wroble v Shaw Env'tl. & Infrastructure Eng'g of N.Y., P.C., 166 AD3d 520, 521 [1st Dept 2018]; Santana v San Mateo Constr.

Corp., 234 AD3d 562, 563 [1st Dept 2025]). Thus, exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required (see also Nawrocki v Proto Constr. & Dev. Corp., 82 AD3d 534, 536 [1st Dept 2011]). Van Osten v Huicatao Corp. (2024 NY Slip Op 34728[U] [Sup Ct, Queens County 2024]) is nonbinding and does not warrant a different result (see McMillan v Out-look Safety LLC., 241 AD3d 1162, 1162 [1st Dept 2025]; see also Herman v Judlau Contr., Inc., 243 AD3d 441, 442 [1st Dept 2025]).THIS CONSTITUTES THE DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT.

ENTERED: February 5, 2026

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/new-york-supreme-court-appellate-division-first-department-appellate-division-of-the-supreme-court-o/2026/gordon-v-triumph-constr-corp-wph1mtri>