.. QRIGINAL· FAXD MAllD blue SUPREME COURT-PART 50 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF YORK Copy

PRESENT

HON.

PABLO TORRES,

Plaintiff(s),

LONG MOTOCROSS ASSOCIATION INC. LONG MOTOCROSS, Orig.

001:

ORDER SUMMARY FAVOR OF

Upon

"the defendant"],

Pablo ["the

2011

"whoops",

2011 "novice rider",

2002 if this stamp appears - NEW

ANDREW G. TARANTINO, JR. A.J.S.C. ----------x

-against-

Torres v Long Is. Motocross Assoc. Inc.

2014 NY Slip Op 31855(U) (2014) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | July 14, 2014

ISLAND and ISLAND INC.,

Defendant(s). ----------x Index No. 7439/2012 Date: 3/18/2014 Adj. Date: 4/29/2014 Motion Dec. MD

DENYING JUDGMENT IN THE DEFENDANTS

consideration of the Notice of Motion for summary judgment in favor of the defendant, Long Island Motocross, Inc. s/h/a Long Island Motocross Association, Inc. and Long Island Motocross, Inc. [collectively the supporting affirmation, and exhibits A through G, the affirmation and affidavits in opposition, and exhibits A through D submitted on behalf of the plaintiff, Torres plaintiff'], and the defendant's Reply Affirmation and exhibits A through D, it is now

ORDERED that the defendant's motion for summary judgment is denied.

This action arises out of an accident that occurred on July 16, after the plaintiff had paid an admission fee to compete in a motorcycle/motocross race at Long Island Motocross track in Yaphank, New York owned by the defendant. The sport of motocross consists of people riding motorcycles on a track with hills, jumps, turns, obstacles and straightaways. According to the plaintiff, the track has turns, jumps, bumps, inclines, declines, and a bridge to jump over.

Although the plaintiff asserts that at the time of the race in he was considered a the evidence is undisputed that at the time of the accident the plaintiff was an experienced rider of approximately fourteen years, had owned at least four motorcycles, and had competed in this type of event, including at the very track where the accident occurred, on many occasions. The plaintiff testified that he stopped racing for a period of time in after he had an accident at the Long Island Motocross track. In addition, over the years the plaintiff had other [* 1] "Acknowledges,

AREAS, AREAS AREAS

AREAS

RELEASES, WAIVES, DISCHARGES, COVENANTS NOT TO SUE

EVENT(S),

EVENT(S) "Releasees," TO FOR LOSS OR ANY OR ON ACCOUNT OF INJURY TO PERSON OR PROPERTY OR RESULTING OF ARISING OUT OF OR TO CAUSED OF RELEASEES OR OTHERWISE.

AGREES TO SA HARMLESS FROM LOSS, OR COST CAUSED OF RELEASEES OR WISE.

ASSUMES FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR RISK OF BODILY INJURY, OR PROPERTY EVENT(S) OF RELEASEES Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012 2

accidents during practices. Nevertheless, before the accident giving rise to this lawsuit, the plaintiff resumed riding and racing and paid a ten dollar entry fee to compete in the race on the day of the accident.

Approximately one week before the accident, the plaintiff signed a release of liability agreeing to hold the defendant harmless in the event of an accident. The release provided that plaintiff

agrees, and represents that he have or will immediately upon entering any of such RESTRICTED and will continuously thereafter, inspect the RESTRICTED which he enters, and he further agrees and warrants that, if at any time, he is in or about RESTRICTED and he feels anything to be unsafe, he will immediately advise the officials of such and if necessary will leave the RESTRICTED and/or refuse to participate further in the EVENT(S).

HEREBY AND the promoters, participants, racing associations, sanctioning organizations or any subdivision thereof, track operators, track owners, officials, motorcycle owners, riders, pit crews, rescue personnel, any persons in any RESTRICTED AREA, promoters, sponsors, advertisers, owners and lessees of premises used to conduct the premises and event inspectors, surveyors, underwriters, consultants and others who give recommendations, directions, or instructions or engage in risk evaluation or loss control activities regarding the premises or and each of them, their directors, officers, agents and employees, all for the purposes herein referred to as FROM ALL LIABILITY THE UNDERSIGNED, his personal representatives, assigns, heirs, and next of kin ANY AND ALL DAMAGE, AND CLAIM DEMANDS THEREFORE THE IN DEATH THE UNDERSIGNED RELATED THE EVENT(S), WHETHER BY THE NEGLIGENCE THE

HEREBY INDEMNIFY AND VE AND HOLD the Releasees and their insurance carrier, and each of them ANY LIABILITY, DAMAGE, they may incur arising out of or related to the EVENT(S) WHETHER BY THE NEGLIGENCE THE OTHER

HEREBY ANY DEA TH DAMAGE, arising out of or related to the whether caused by the NEGLIGENCE or otherwise. [* 2] OF

DANGEROUS

INJURIES COMPOUNDED OR RESCUE OPERATIONS OR PROCEDURES OF RELEASEES.

DESPITE THIS OR ANYONE ON MAKES "RELEASEES" ABOVE, TO AND SA HOLD HARMLESS RELEASEES INSURANCE OF FROM EXPENSES, ATTORNEYS' FEES, LOSS, OR COSTS INCUR DUE TO OF "RELEASEES" ABOVE, IS BASED ON OF OR OTHERWISE.

INCLUDING RESCUE OPERATIONS State

THIS OF ASSUMPTION OF RISK FULLY UNDERSTAND ITS TERMS, UNDERSTAND UP SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS SIGNING SIGNED WITHOUT INDUCEMENT, ASSURANCE OR GUARANTEE TO SIGNATURE TO COMPLETE UNCONDITIONAL OF TO ALLOWED Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012

HEREBY acknowledges that THE ACTIVITIES THE EVENT(S) ARE VERY and involve the risk of serious injury and/or death and/or property damage. Each of the UNDERSIGNED also expressly acknowledges that RECEIVED MAY BE INCREASED BY NEGLIGENT THE

IF, RELEASE, I MY BEHALF A CLAIM AGAINST THE NAMED I AGREE INDEMNIFY VE AND THE AND THEIR CARRIER, AND EACH THEM ANY LITIGATION LIABILITY, DAMAGE THEY MAY THE CLAIM MADE AGAINST ANY THE NAMED WHETHER THE CLAIM THE NEGLIGENCE THE RELEASEE

Hereby agrees that in the event that I sustain any injury while in any Restricted Areas that any rescue personnel or medical personnel may release such medical information about my condition to representatives of the promoter, sanctioning organization, track operator, or track owner, as necessary to allow such individuals to properly report that information to appropriate representatives of the sanctioning organization and/or insurance carriers.

HEREBY agrees that this Release and Waiver of Liability, Assumption of Risk and Indemnity Agreement extends to all acts of negligence by the Releasees, NEGLIGENT and is intended to be as broad and inclusive as is permitted by the laws of the Province or in which the Event(s) is/are conducted and that if any portion hereof is held invalid, it is agreed that the balance shall, notwithstanding continue in full legal force and effect.

I HA VE READ RELEASE AND WAIVER LIABILITY, AND INDEMNITY AGREEMENT, THAT I HA VE GIVEN BY IT, AND HAVE IT FREELY AND VOLUNTARILY ANY BEING MADE ME AND INTEND MY BE A AND RELEASE ALL LIABILITY THE GREATEST EXTENT BYLAW. 3 [* 3] 180

" track."

On

"[t]here day."

PVC

Torres v Long Is. Motocross Assoc. Inc.

2014 NY Slip Op 31855(U) (2014) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | July 14, 2014

PVC

On

"hard-like-rock" PVC

PVC Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012 4

In addition to this release, the plaintiff signed three similar, all-encompassing releases before the subject accident.

The defendant's track consists of a starting gate that leads to a sweeping tum of degrees, which then into a second turn that bears right. The plaintiffs accident occurred in the vicinity of the second turn. The area of the accident is built up with a dirt berm, which is elevated approximately two feet in height. According to the defendant's principal, Joseph Merrill, if a rider were to lose control at the second tum ... he is probably going to go off the

the other side of the berm at the second turn is where the accident occurred. The ground there is flat and composed of dirt. There is a fence approximately twelve feet from the berm. There are no rocks or boulders in this area. Although Merrill inspects the track on a regular basis during the course of the day, he does not inspect the area where the accident occurred because is nothing to inspect. It's usually good all

According to the defendant's testimony, Long Island Motocross used an irrigation system to water the dirt track to minimize dust. The track's irrigation system is supplemented by County water supplied by a nearby hydrant. The water from the hydrant is connected to a three-inch pipe that is on the edge of the property which in tum is connected to the main water source. Merrill denied that the equipment was installed in the area of the plaintiffs accident.

According to the plaintiffs affidavit, the accident occurred in the area of the second curve of the track. the day of the accident all of the novice riders lined up at the starting line. At the second tum the plaintiff was bumped from behind and lost control of his motorcycle. He drove off the track on to the side of the track and then fell on his left side. The plaintiffs body continued to propel forward whereupon he collided with the equipment that the plaintiff identified in photographs as fair and accurate representations of pipe which his body contacted after he lost control of the motorcycle. 1

The plaintiff testified that he had never seen the equipment in the vicinity of this area of the track before the accident, that it was extremely close to the track, and was in an area where riders had fallen in the past. When the plaintiff returned to the scene of the accident approximately one week later, the equipment had been removed and a hole or trench remained in its place. The plaintiff also identified a post accident photograph depicting what appeared to him to be the same equipment but

in a different location further away from where the accident occurred.

1 The challenged you-tube video of the accident scene referred to in the plaintiffs opposing papers was neither viewed nor considered by the Court in reaching its decision. [* 4] PVC One

PVC

"Agreements

unenforceable"

"Every

unenforceable."

102, N.Y.S.2d 400 306; 301, N.Y.S.2d 10 220 N.Y.S.2d N.Y.S.2d 2014].

220 N.Y.S.2d Such Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012 5

The affidavits of two eye-witnesses were also submitted in opposition to the motion. Both affiants competed in the race where the plaintiff was injured; both confirmed the location of the pipe as being at the second turn in the vicinity of the accident. of the witnesses averred that he had gone to the track to practice the day before the accident and the pipe was not there. The same witness attested that in the three years he raced on the track before the accident, he never observed a pipe anywhere on the track. The other witness averred that his bike hit the plaintiffs bike from behind and that he saw the plaintiff fall and hit a pipe sticking out of the ground.

The defendant moves for summary judgment dismissing the complaint insofar as asserted against it, based on the agreements signed by the plaintiff purporting to release, inter alia, the defendant from liability for his injuries, and on the doctrine of primary assumption of risk.

General Obligations Law §5-326 entitled, exempting pools, gymnasiums, places of public amusement or recreation and similar establishments from liability for negligence void and provides:

covenant, agreement or understanding in or in connection with, or collateral to, any contract, membership application, ticket of admission or similar writing, entered into between the owner or operator of any pool, gymnasium, place of amusement or recreation, or similar establishment and the user of such facilities, pursuant to which such owner or operator receives a fee or other compensation for the use of such facilities, which exempts the said owner or operator from liability for damages caused by or resulting from the negligence of the owner, operator or person in charge of such establishment, or their agents, servants or employees, shall be deemed to be void as against

public policy and wholly

In the absence of a contravening public policy, exculpatory provisions in a contract, purporting to insulate one of the parties from liability resulting from that party's own negligence, although disfavored by the law and closely scrutinized by the courts, generally are enforced, subject however to various qualifications (see, Gross v. Sweet, 49 N.Y.2d 424 365, N.E.2d Van Dyke Prods. v. Eastman Kodak Co., 12 N.Y.2d 239 337, 189 N.E.2d 693; Ciofalo v. Vic Tanney Gyms, N.Y.2d 294, 962, 177 N.E.2d 925; see also Deutsch v. Woodridge Segway, LLC, 117 A.D.3d 776, 985 716 [2d Dept. Where the language of the exculpatory agreement expresses in unequivocal terms the intention of the parties to relieve a defendant of liability for the defendant's negligence, the agreement will be enforced (id., at 297, 962, 177 N.E.2d 925). an agreement will be viewed as wholly void, however, where it purports to grant exemption from liability for willful or grossly negligent acts or where a special relationship exists between the parties such that an overriding public interest demands that such a contract provision be rendered ineffectual (see, Gross v. Sweet, supra, and cases cited therein). [* 5] 540,

106; 1201, N.Y.S.2d PVC PVC

G.O.L. "novice", "user" PVC

"user" Second 841N.Y.S.2d308 2007]; 605, 670 N.Y.S.2d 504 830 N.Y.S.2d 2007]),

N.Y.2d 107, 571N.Y.S.2d689

N.Y.S.2d 80

PVC

Utica 103 N.Y.S.2d 2013]

"

participation'" State 90 N.Y.S.2d 202; Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012 6

Thus, an otherwise enforceable release will not insulate a party from grossly negligent conduct (see Sommer v. Federal Signal Corp., 79 N.Y.2d 544, 583 N.Y.S.2d 957, 593 N.E.2d 1365; Gross v. Sweet, supra at see also Schwartz v. Martin, 82 A.D.3d 919 217 [2d Dept. 2011]). The evidence in the record that on the day of the accident an exposed pipe(s) was recently located/placed in an area of the track known to be an area where riders are likely to fall raises a triable issue of fact that the placement of the pipe was grossly negligent precluding summary judgment in the defendant's favor based on the releases (Gross v Sweet, supra).

Torres v Long Is. Motocross Assoc. Inc.

2014 NY Slip Op 31855(U) (2014) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | July 14, 2014

The defendant urges that the plaintiff is not entitled to invoke the protection of §5-326 because notwithstanding his rating as a he is an experienced motorcycle/motocross rider, and therefore, not a as that term has been construed in the Courts. If the placement of the pipe can be regarded as gross negligence, whether the plaintiff is a statutory user is academic as the statute does not exempt a party's gross negligence. However, even if the placement of the pipe is considered to be mere ordinary negligence, this Court still finds that the plaintiff is entitled to the protection of the statute since 1) the plaintiff is a as defined by the statute and construed by the Department (see Sisino v. Island Motocross of New York, Inc., 41A.D.3d462, [2d Dept. Petrie v. Bridgehampton Road Races Corp., 248 A.D.2d [2d Dept. 1998]; see also Tuttle v. TRC Enterprises, Inc., 38 A.D.3d 992, 854 [3d Dept. 2) the defendant is an owner or operator of a place of amusement or similar establishment (see Lago v Krol/age, 78 95, 575 N.E.2d [1991]), and 3) the plaintiff paid a fee to participate in the race (cf Stone v Bridgehampton Race Circuit, 217 A.D.2d 541, 629 [2d Dept. 1995]).

The defendant's argument that the plaintiff failed to raise an issue of fact because he did not oppose the motion with an expert affidavit attesting that the track was unsafe is unavailing. The burden on the motion is on the movant, not the opponent. If the defendant asserts that the location of the pipe in the area of the accident did not pose an unreasonably increased risk of injury to riders, it was incumbent on the defendant as movant to support its motion with an expert affidavit (see L & D Service Station, Inc. v. First Ins. Co., A.D.3d 782, 962 187 [2d Dept. [as a general rule, party does not carry its burden in moving for summary judgment by pointing to gaps in opponent's proof, but must affirmatively demonstrate merit of its claim or defense).

As to the defendant's second basis for summary judgment, the doctrine of primary assumption of the risk provides that 'by engaging in a sport or recreational activity, a participant consents to those commonly appreciated risks which are inherent in and arise out of the nature of the sport generally and flow from such (Kirkland v. Hall, 38 A.D.3d 497, 498, 832 N.Y.S.2d 232, quoting Morgan v. of New York, N.Y.2d 471, 484, 662 421, 685 N.E.2d see Anandv. Kapoor, 15 N.Y.3d 946, 947-948, 917 [* 6] N.Y.S.2d

Sykes 707 N.Y.S.2d Union School N.Y.S.2d N.Y.S.2d N.Y.S.2d "Moreover,

results'" 105, 108, 809 N.Y.S.2d 270, N.Y.S.2d

State 90 N.Y.S.2d 202; 100 N.Y.S.2d N.Y.S.2d 105, 108, 809 N.Y.S.2d 106 1050, N.Y.S.2d

PVC

A.J.S.C.

DISPOSITION _XX_NON-FINAL DISPOSITION Torress v Long Island Motocross Index #7439/2012 7

86, 942 N.E.2d 295). The principle of primary assumption of risk extends to those risks associated with the construction of a playing field and any open and obvious condition thereon (see v. County of Erie, 94 N.Y.2d 912, 913, 374, 728 N.E.2d 973; Palladino v. Lindenhurst Free Dist., 84 A.D.3d 1194, 1195, 924 474; Brown v. City of New York, 69 A.D.3d 893, 895 442; Manoly v. City of New York, 29 A.D.3d 649, 649-650, 816 499). it is not necessary to the application of the doctrine that the injured plaintiff may have foreseen the exact manner in which the injury occurred 'so long as he or she is aware of the potential for injury of the mechanism from which the injury (Joseph v. New York Racing Assn., 28 A.D.3d 526, quoting Maddox v. City of New York, 66 N.Y.2d 278, 496 726, 487 N.E.2d 553).

The doctrine, however, does not serve as a bar to liability if the risk is unassumed, concealed, or unreasonably increased (see Morgan v. of New York, N.Y.2d at 485, 662 421, 685 N.E.2d see also Mussara v. Mega Funworks, Inc., A.D.3d 185, 952 568; Toro v. New York Racing Assn., Inc., 95 A.D.3d 999, 944 229; Joseph v. New York Racing Assn., 28 A.D.3d 526; cf Herman v. Lifeplex, LLC, A.D.3d 966 473).

The plaintiff raised a triable issue of fact that the considerable risks inherent to the sport of motocross racing were unreasonably increased by the defendant's recent placement of the pipe, without warning, in an area known to be one where competitors frequently fall. Whether the condition was open and obvious to users including the plaintiff is also an issue of fact based on the non-party witness affidavit that the pipe was not there the day before the accident, and the plaintiff's affidavit that he had never seen it before the accident occurred. Thus, summary judgment in favor of the defendant is denied.

Dated: ___ JR.,

FINAL [* 7]