

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

Archie v. Cunningham Assoc., L.P.

Archie, 2026 N.Y. Slip Op. 03772 (Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division Second Judicial Department 2026) · No. 2025-05876 · Decided June 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Second Department, reversed an order denying the defendants' motion for summary judgment in a premises-liability action arising from the plaintiff's alleged slip and fall on ice. The court held that the storm-in-progress doctrine applied and that the defendants' salting and ice-melt efforts neither created nor exacerbated a hazardous condition.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cheryl E. Chambers, J.P.; Helen Voutsinas, J.; Janice A. Taylor, J.; Phillip Hom, J.
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department
DECIDED	June 17, 2026
DOCKET	2025-05876
DISPOSITION	reversed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The defendants appealed from an order of the Supreme Court, Queens County, denying their motion for summary judgment dismissing the amended complaint in a premises-liability personal-injury action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Appellate Division reviewed whether the defendants established prima facie entitlement to summary judgment as a matter of law and whether the plaintiff raised a triable issue of fact in opposition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published New York Appellate Division opinion; uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports.
PARTIES	Cunningham Associates, L.P., Wen Management Corp. v. Keyonna Archie

TOPICS

premises liability

summary judgment

negligence

personal injury

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

premises liability

personal injury

negligence

civil procedure

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the defendants established prima facie entitlement to summary judgment under New York's storm-in-progress doctrine.
2. Whether the defendants' efforts to apply salt or ice melt created a hazardous condition or exacerbated a natural hazard created by the storm.
3. Whether the plaintiff raised a triable issue of fact in opposition to the defendants' motion.

HOLDINGS

1. A property owner or manager moving for summary judgment in a premises-liability case may establish prima facie entitlement to judgment by showing that a storm was in progress when the plaintiff fell on an icy condition. The defendants made that showing through deposition testimony, meteorological evidence, and certified climatological data.
2. The defendants' application of salt or ice melt during the storm did not, on the evidence presented, create a hazardous condition or exacerbate the natural hazard created by the storm.
3. The plaintiff failed to raise a triable issue of fact as to whether the defendants' ice-removal or prevention efforts created a hazardous condition or exacerbated a natural hazard.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*"Under the storm in progress doctrine, a landowner 'will not be held liable in negligence for a plaintiff's injuries sustained as the result of an icy condition occurring during an ongoing storm or for a reasonable time thereafter'" ([*1])*

*"However, even if a storm is ongoing, once a property owner elects to remove snow or ice, it must do so with reasonable care or it could be held liable for creating a hazardous condition or exacerbating a natural hazard created by the storm'" ([*2])*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On February 4, 2022, at approximately 8:47 p.m., Keyonna Archie allegedly slipped and fell on ice on a walkway of a residential building owned by Cunningham Associates, L.P. and managed by Wen Management Corp. The defendants submitted deposition testimony, an expert meteorologist's affidavit, and certified climatological data showing that a storm was in progress when the accident occurred. The evidence also showed that the defendants had applied salt or ice melt to prevent ice accumulation, but the court found that these efforts neither created a hazardous condition nor exacerbated the natural hazard created by the storm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Archie sued Cunningham Associates, L.P., the owner of a residential building, and Wen Management Corp., its manager, after allegedly slipping and falling on ice on a walkway. The defendants moved for summary judgment. The Supreme Court, Queens County, denied the motion, and the Appellate Division reversed and granted summary judgment to the defendants.

DISPOSITION

reversed

CASES CITED

- Colon v. New York City Tr. Auth., 201 A.D.3d 867, 868
- Grossman v. Bridgeview Holdings, LLC, 238 A.D.3d 1004, 1005
- Jackson v. City of New York, 238 A.D.3d 1126, 1127
- Sherman v. New York State Thruway Auth., 27 N.Y.3d 1019, 1020-1021
- Pennino v. Brooklyn Kings Plaza, LLC, 186 A.D.3d 1701, 1702
- Koh Chong Wong v. Kontonis, 128 A.D.3d 1019, 1020
- Sanfilippo v. Kull, 230 A.D.3d 709, 710-711
- Balagoyzyan v. Federal Realty L.P., 191 A.D.3d 749, 751
- Rivera v. New York City Health & Hosps. Corp., 170 A.D.3d 1214, 1214

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Archie v Cunningham Assoc., L.P. - 2026 NY Slip Op 03772 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 Archie v Cunningham Assoc., L.P. 2026 NY Slip Op 03772 June 17, 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. Keyonna Archie, respondent, v Cunningham Associates, L.P., et al., appellants. Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department Decided on June 17, 2026 2025-05876, (Index No. 708056/22) Cheryl E. Chambers, J.P. Helen Voutsinas Janice A. Taylor Phillip Hom, JJ. Morris Duffy Alonso Faley & Pitcoff, New York, NY (Iryna S. Krauchanka and Kevin G. Faley of counsel), for appellants.

Mallilo & Grossman, Flushing, NY (Scott A. Kutcher 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 (Carmen R. Velasquez, J.), entered April 11, 2025.

The order denied the defendants' motion for summary judgment dismissing the amended complaint. ORDERED that the order is reversed, on the law, with costs, and the defendants' motion for summary judgment dismissing the amended complaint is granted.

On February 4, 2022, at approximately 8:47 p.m., the plaintiff allegedly was injured when she slipped and fell on ice on a walkway of a residential building, which was owned by the defendant Cunningham Associates, L.P., and managed by the defendant Wen Management Corp. (hereinafter Wen).

The plaintiff commenced this action against the defendants to recover damages for personal injuries. The defendants moved for summary judgment dismissing the amended complaint. In an order entered April 11, 2025, the Supreme Court denied the defendants' motion.

The defendants appeal. "In a premises liability case, a defendant property owner who moves for summary judgment has the initial burden of making a prima facie showing that it neither created the allegedly dangerous or defective condition nor had actual or constructive notice of its existence" (Colon v New York City Tr. Auth., 201 AD3d 867, 868 [internal quotation marks omitted]; see Grossman v Bridgeview Holdings, LLC, 238 AD3d 1004, 1005).

"This burden may be established by presenting evidence that there was a storm in progress when the injured plaintiff allegedly slipped and fell" (Colon v New York City Tr. Auth., 201 AD3d at 868 [internal quotation marks omitted]). "Under the storm in progress doctrine, a landowner 'will not be held liable in negligence for a plaintiff's injuries sustained as the result of an icy condition occurring during an ongoing storm or for a reasonable time thereafter'" (Jackson v City of New York, 238 AD3d 1126, 1127, quoting Sherman v New York State Thruway Auth., 27 NY3d 1019, 1020-1021; see Grossman v Bridgeview Holdings, LLC, 238 AD3d at 1005).

"A lull in the storm does not impose a duty to remove the accumulation of snow or ice before the storm ceases in its entirety" (Pennino v Brooklyn Kings Plaza, LLC, 186 AD3d 1701, 1702 [internal quotation marks omitted]). "'However, even if a storm is ongoing, once a property [*2] owner elects to remove snow or ice, it must do so with reasonable care or it could be held liable for creating a hazardous condition or exacerbating a natural hazard created by the storm'" (Colon v New York City Tr.

Auth., 201 AD3d at 868, quoting Koh Chong Wong v Kontonis, 128 AD3d 1019, 1020; see Sanfilippo v Kull, 230 AD3d 709, 710). "The mere failure of a defendant to remove all of the snow and ice, without more, does not establish that the defendant increased the risk of harm" (Balagoyzyan v Federal Realty L.P., 191 AD3d 749, 751 [internal quotation marks omitted]).

Here, the evidence submitted in support of the defendants' motion, which included, inter alia, transcripts of the deposition testimony of the plaintiff and of two employees of Wen and an affidavit of the defendants' expert meteorologist, coupled with certified climatological data,

established the defendants' prima facie entitlement to judgment as a matter of law dismissing the amended complaint.

The evidence demonstrated that there was a storm in progress at the time of the plaintiff's accident and that the defendants' efforts to prevent ice accumulation by applying salt or ice melt neither created a hazardous condition nor exacerbated a natural hazard created by the storm (see *Rivera v New York City Health & Hosp. Corp.*, 170 AD3d 1214, 1214; *Koh Chong Wong v Kontonis*, 128 AD3d at 1020).

In opposition, the plaintiff failed to raise a triable issue of fact as to whether the defendants' ice removal and/or prevention efforts created a hazardous condition or exacerbated a natural hazard created by the storm (see *Sanfilippo v Kull*, 230 AD3d at 710-711; *Rivera v New York City Health & Hosp. Corp.*, 170 AD3d at 1214).

The plaintiff's remaining contentions are without merit. Accordingly, the Supreme Court should have granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment dismissing the amended complaint. CHAMBERS, J.P., VOUTSINAS, TAYLOR and HOM, 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.