

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

Kelly v. Snap-on Inc.

Kelly, 2026 NY Slip Op 03567 (Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division Fourth Judicial Department 2026) · No. 354 CA 25-00993 · Decided June 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Fourth Department, affirmed an order denying defendants' motion to compel disclosure of Medicaid billing records after an in camera review. The court held that the defendants' argument that the records were not privileged was unpreserved and that the trial court did not abuse its broad discretion in supervising disclosure.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Whalen, P.J.; Curran, J.; Ogden, J.; Nowak, J.; DelConte, J.
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department
DECIDED	June 5, 2026
DOCKET	354 CA 25-00993
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants appealed from an order denying, after an in camera review, the portion of their motion seeking to compel production of John M. Moudy's Medicaid billing records.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Appellate Division reviewed the discovery ruling for abuse of discretion and declined to disturb it absent a clear abuse of that discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Snap-on Incorporated, Snap-on Tools Company, LLC v. Tammy L. Kelly, Michelle Moudy, as guardians of the person and property of John M. Moudy

TOPICS

discovery dispute

medical records privacy

medicare medicaid

guardianships

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

health law

guardianships

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants' contention that the Medicaid billing records were not privileged was preserved for appellate review.
2. Whether Supreme Court abused its discretion by denying defendants' motion to compel disclosure of Moudy's Medicaid billing records after conducting an in camera review.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants' contention that the Medicaid billing records were not privileged, having been raised for the first time on appeal, was not properly before the Appellate Division.
2. Supreme Court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendants' motion to compel disclosure of Moudy's Medicaid billing records after reviewing the records in camera.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“'[T]rial courts have broad discretion in supervising disclosure and, absent a clear abuse of that discretion, a trial court's exercise of such authority should not be disturbed'”

“'falls comfortably within the court's broad discretion to control discovery'”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

John M. Moudy allegedly sustained severe physical and cognitive deficits in a motor vehicle accident. His guardians, Tammy L. Kelly and Michelle Moudy, sued for damages, and defendants sought disclosure of his pre-accident treatment records, including Medicaid billing records. After an in camera inspection, Supreme Court ordered disclosure of most records but withheld the Medicaid billing records.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs commenced a personal-injury action arising from a motor vehicle accident. Defendants moved to compel production of Moudy's pre-accident medical, mental-health, substance-abuse, and Medicaid billing records. Supreme Court, Niagara County, granted the motion as to most requested records but denied it as to the Medicaid billing records, and the Appellate Division affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Ciesinski v Town of Aurora, 202 AD2d 984, 985 [4th Dept 1994]
- Sanabria v SJ Trans, Inc., 238 AD3d 1502, 1502-1503 [4th Dept 2025]
- Crysler v Erk [appeal No. 2], 227 AD3d 1410, 1412 [4th Dept 2024]
- Manner v Yancey, 218 AD3d 1196, 1197 [4th Dept 2023]
- Sims v Reyes, 195 AD3d 133, 137 [4th Dept 2021]
- Barnes v Habuda, 118 AD3d 1443, 1444 [4th Dept 2014]
- Manner v Yancey, 239 AD3d 1322, 1324 [4th Dept 2025]

OPINION

Kelly v. Snap-on Inc. 2026 NY Slip Op 03567

PER CURIAM.

Kelly v Snap-on Inc. - 2026 NY Slip Op 03567 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 Kelly v Snap-on Inc. 2026 NY Slip Op 03567 June 5, 2026 Appellate Division, Fourth 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. TAMMY L. KELLY AND MICHELLE MOUDY, AS GUARDIANS OF THE PERSON AND PROPERTY OF JOHN M. MOUDY, PLAINTIFFS-RESPONDENTS, v SNAP-ON INCORPORATED, SNAP-ON TOOLS COMPANY, LLC, DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS, ET AL., DEFENDANT. Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department Decided on June 5, 2026 354 CA 25-00993 Present: Whalen, P.J., Curran, Ogden, Nowak, And Delconte, JJ. BURDEN & HANSEN, LLC, BUFFALO (SARAH E. HANSEN OF COUNSEL), FOR DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS. LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP, BUFFALO (JOHN A. COLLINS OF COUNSEL), FOR PLAINTIFFS-RESPONDENTS. Appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Niagara County (Frank Caruso, J.), entered January 10, 2025. The order, among other things, directed that certain records be disclosed, with the exception of Medicaid billing records. [*1] It is hereby ORDERED that the order so appealed from is unanimously affirmed without costs. Memorandum: Plaintiffs Tammy L. Kelly and Michelle Moudy, as guardians of the person and property of John M. Moudy (Moudy), commenced this action seeking damages for injuries that Moudy sustained in a motor vehicle accident, which allegedly resulted in Moudy suffering from severe physical and cognitive deficits. Defendants Snap-on Incorporated and Snap-on Tools Company, LLC (collectively, defendants) appeal from an order of Supreme Court that denied the part of defendants' motion seeking to compel plaintiffs to produce Moudy's Medicaid billing records following the court's in camera inspection of the requested records. We affirm. At the outset, we note that defendants' contention that the Medicaid billing records are not privileged was raised for the first time on appeal and is thus not properly before us (see Ciesinski v Town of Aurora , 202 AD2d 984, 985 [4th Dept 1994]). With respect to defendants' preserved contention,

we conclude that the court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to the extent that it sought an order compelling plaintiffs to produce the Medicaid billing records. "[T]rial courts have broad discretion in supervising disclosure and, absent a clear abuse of that discretion, a trial court's exercise of such authority should not be disturbed" (*Sanabria v SJ Trans , Inc .* , 238 AD3d 1502 , 1502-1503 [4th Dept 2025] [internal quotation marks omitted]; see *Crysler v Erk* [appeal No. 2], 227 AD3d 1410 , 1412 [4th Dept 2024]; *Manner v Yancey* , 218 AD3d 1196, 1197 [4th Dept 2023]). Here, defendants moved to compel disclosure of, inter alia, Moudy's pre-accident medical, mental health, and substance abuse treatment records, including the Medicaid billing records. Following an in camera review of the requested records, the court granted the motion insofar as it sought disclosure of most of the records identified, but it denied defendants' motion to the extent that it sought disclosure of Moudy's Medicaid billing records. The court's determination to deny defendants' motion with respect to disclosure of the Medicaid billing records after reviewing them in camera "falls comfortably within the court's broad discretion to control discovery" (*Sims v Reyes* , 195 AD3d 133 , 137 [4th Dept 2021] [internal quotation marks omitted]; see generally *Barnes v Habuda* , 118 AD3d 1443 , 1444 [4th Dept 2014]), and we [*2] perceive no abuse of the court's discretion in that regard (see generally *Manner v Yancey* , 239 AD3d 1322 , 1324 [4th Dept 2025]). Entered: June 5, 2026 Ann Dillon Flynn 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.