



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

UNITED STATES COURT SOUTHERN OF YORK

LONG FASHION CO.,

Plaintiffs,

FASHION AVENUE

P P S:

Plaintiffs ASSOCIATES, PLLC

#1003

SILLS CUMMIS GROSS P.C. 101 Park

OPINION DISTRICT DISTRICT NEW -----x TIAN LTD.,

-against-

SWEATER KNITS, LLC,

Defendant. -----x A E A R A N C E

Attorneys for HANG & 136-18 39TH Avenue, Flushing, NY 11354 By: William Brown, Esq.

Jian Hang, Esq. Kevin Vorhis, Esq.

Attorneys for Defendant

& Avenue, 28th Floor New York, NY 10178 By: Kenneth Schachter, Esq.

13 Civ. 8258

Sweet,



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

(" Fashion "Defendant")

("Tian "Pl aintiff")

Prior

2008 2010 ,

2010,

On 2013 , D . J .

Defendant Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits , LLC Avenue" or the has moved pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Ci vil Procedure , for an order granting partial summary judgment to dismiss the claim of plaintiff Tian Long Fashion Co., Ltd . Long" or the for air freight costs .

Based on the facts and conclusions set forth below, the motion of the Defendant for partial summary judgment i s granted in part and denied in part.

Proceedings

During the peri od through Fashion Avenue entered into numerous agreements with Tian Long for Tian Long to manufacture and deliver certain sweaters to Fashion Avenue .

In the parties stopped doing business as a result of disputes between the parties over certain performance issues. November 19, Tian Long brought this action alleging unpaid invoices of \$1,316 , 223 . 12 , unreasonable

1

Undisputed Plaintiff's

CEO

United States.

People's chargebacks o f \$149,679.15, unreasonable reductions of \$191,582 and \$712,751.30 in unpaid airfreight costs.

The instant motion was heard and marked fully submitted on March 24 , 2016.



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

The Facts

The facts are contained in the Defendant's Statement of Material Facts, the Counterstatement of Material Facts in Dispute and affidavits of Ronald Hollandsworth, of Fashion Avenue ("Hollandsworth"), Kenneth Schachter, counsel Fashion Avenue, and Xiao Wen Gao, general manager of Tian Long ("Gao") and are not in dispute except as noted below.

Fashion Avenue is a New York limited liability company engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, importing and selling women's fashion knitted garments to retailers throughout the

Tian Long is a sweater manufacturer located in the Republic of China. The sweater business is seasonal and

2

On Fashion Avenue produces different sweaters for different seasons.

It is imperative to Fashion Avenue's business model that it receive garments by dates agreed upon with a manufacturer. If Fashion Avenue does not receive garments by the agreed upon date, it cannot meet the required delivery dates set by its retailers, who seek to sell the sweaters in and for the appropriate season.

After all the terms of a particular sale were negotiated, Fashion Avenue would send Tian Long a purchase order memorializing the parties' agreement. Though Tian Long asserts that on a number of occasions, negotiations continued to take place after Fashion Avenue sent Tian Long a purchase order, Tian Long also asserts that the purchase agreement was not a complete memorialization of the parties' agreement. The parties agree that Tian Long did not have its own purchase document or contract that it would send to Fashion Avenue.

November 19, 2013 , over two years after the parties stopped doing business, Tian Long filed its complaint against Fashion Avenue alleging, in part, that it is due unpaid air

3

"Purchase Orders")

Purchase 2010 2010 ,

Purchase Order Paid ("DDP")

United States.



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

DDP

Purchase DDP Purchase

Purchase freight costs for shipping various women's sweater garments to Fashion Avenue. Tian Long claims it is owed air freight costs for the specific purchase orders identified in Exhibit 4 to the Complaint (the in the amount of \$712,751.30. Fashion Avenue contests that it owes that amount for air freight.

The Orders were sent to Tian Long between January 18, and September 16, all of which were for various styles of women's sweaters. Each provided a Delivery, Duty for each garment, which included all costs to ship the garments to Fashion Avenue in the

(Hollandsworth Dec.)

means that the shipper is responsible for choosing the mode of transportation and paying all the shipping costs and duties involved in transporting the goods to the destination named in the Order. terms were included in each of the Orders for which Tian Long now seeks to be paid the air freight costs. Fashion Avenue claims that for certain

Orders for which Tian Long was not able to make timely delivery of the sweaters, Tian Long shipped those goods by air carrier. Tian Long claims that a number of deliveries were sent

4

"FA TO PAY 50 % OR " FA

PAY 50%

Purchase Order

"Air Purchase Order

DDP

Orders . via air at Fashion Avenue's request. For certain of those air freight shipments Fashion Avenue agreed to pay Tian Long a portion of the air freight costs. Fashion Avenue claims that in each instance in which Fashion Avenue agreed to pay a portion of the air freight costs , it sent an email to Tian Long confirming the agreement and did pay for those costs . Fashion Avenue claims that in each instance where Fashion Avenue agreed to pay a portion of the air freight costs , the corresponding Tian Long invoice included a charge for that air freight and stated either (1) [Fashion



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

Avenue] AGREE AIR" (2) [Fashion Avenue] AIR."

The specific numbers for which Fashion Avenue claims it agreed to pay a portion of the air freight costs are 51796 , 51823 , 51829, 52167, 52227 , 52161 , 51826 , 52248 , 52180 , 52255 , 52229 , 52232, 52129, 51823 and 52299 (the

Freight Orders .") . For every other issued under the Incoterms (where Fashion Avenue did not expressly agree to pay air freight), the corresponding invoices did not mention or contain any charge for air freight. Fashion Avenue has already paid the air freight costs for those Air Freight

Tian Long disputes this statement and believes there are

5

Standard

P.

U. S .

Supp. 1205, 1990) U. S. other i nvoices for which Fashion Avenue directed Tian Long to use air freight and agreed to pay for the additional costs .

The Applicable

Summary judgment is appropriate only where "there is no genui ne issue as to any material fact and . . . the movi ng party i s entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. " Fed . R. Civ . 56(c) . A dispute is "genuine" if "the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." Anderson v . Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 242 , 248 (1986) . The relevant inquiry on application for summary judgment is "whether the evidence presents a sufficient disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one- sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law . " Id . at 251 - 52 . A court is not charged with weighing the evidence and determining its truth, but with determining whether there is a genuine issue for trial . Westinghouse Elec . Corp. v. N.Y. City Transit Auth., 735 F . 1212 (S . D. N.Y . (quoting Anderson , 477

at 249) . "[T]he mere existence of some alleged factual dispute between the parties will not defeat an otherwise properly supported motion for summary judgment; the requirement

6

fact." U.S .



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

Commerce. See

2002 U.S. LEXIS 5096 , 2002).

See Supp.

2006). "are

purchaser." See is that there be no genuine issue of material Anderson, 477 at 247 - 48 (emphasis in original)

The Plaintiff Was Responsible for Transportation Costs

Incoterms are a set of international commercial terms published by the International Chamber of Commerce. *St. Paul Guardian Ins. Co. v. Neuromed med. Sys. & Support, Dist.* at* 9 (S.D. N.Y. Mar. 26, 2006). Incoterms are the most widely recognized non-statutory definitions of trade.

S. K. I Beer Corp. v. Baltika Brewery, 443 F.2d 313, 315 n.4 (E.D.N.Y. 1970). The terms used to allocate the costs of freight and insurance in addition to designating the point in time when the risk of loss passes to the

id. (internal quotations omitted).

The DDP incoterms allocate the total cost of freight to the seller (i.e. Tian Long). Specifically DDP is defined as:

The seller delivers the goods when the goods are placed at the disposal of the buyer, cleared for import on the arriving means of transport ready for unloading at the named place of destination. The seller bears all the costs and risks involved in bringing the goods to the place of destination and has an obligation to clear the goods not only for export but also for import, to pay any duty

7

See U.S., 11-00291, 2013 Ct. LEXIS

(U.S.C.I.T. 2013) 2010 INCOTERMS RULES,

Oct. 2015) 2010"];

05-civ-00466, 2008 U.S. LEXIS Pa. 2008) DDP



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

DDP

See INCOTERMS 2010 (DDP

INCOTERMS 2000

Orders

Orders DDP

for both export and import and to carry out all customs formalities.

Apex Exps. v. Intl. Trade 164, at *23 n. 7 Dec. 31, (quoting Incoterms

at 69.); THE <http://www.iccwbo.org/products-and-services/trade-facilitation/incoterms-2010/the-incotermsrules> (last visited 23, [hereinafter "Incoterms see also SMS Demag, Inc. v. ABB Transmissione & Distribuzione, S.P.A., Dist. 25637, at *42 (W.D. Mar. 31, (holding meant that the parties contemplated the seller would be responsible for shipping the goods). The terms place the obligation on the seller to contract for the carriage of the goods and is used irrespective of the method of transportation.

is classified under "rules of any mode or modes of transportation"); ("the seller must contract at his own expense for the carriage of the goods to the named place of destination").

In this case, it is undisputed that Fashion Avenue sent Tian Long Purchase for all of the disputed transactions. It is further undisputed that these Purchase

incorporated the Incoterms. Tian Long has put forth

8

Under 2-207 Uniform ("UCC")

See CLS U.C.C.

2000);

120, N.Y.S. 503, 508

Orders 2-207 UCC.



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

UCC 2-104

See CLS UCC 2-207 no contradictory confirmatory document that it sent to Fashion Avenue. Instead Tian Long claims that the terms were ambiguous and ran contrary to the course of dealings between the parties.

Section of the New York Commercial Code a written confirmation sent within a reasonable time of an oral agreement operates as an acceptance even if it includes additional terms. NY § 2-207(1); see also Bayway Ref Co. v. Oxygenated Mktg. A.G., 215 F.3d 219, 223 (2d Cir. Bazak Intern. Corp. v. Mast Industries, Inc., 73 N.Y.2d 113, 538 2d (1989) (holding a purchase order is sufficient to be a confirmatory document even if it does not contain express words of confirmation). In this case, the Purchase serve as a written confirmation as outlined by Section of the

Where the parties to the contract are both merchants within the meaning of such terms become part of the contract unless: (a) the offer expressly limits the acceptance to the terms of the offer; (b) they materially alter it; or (c) notification of objection to them has already been given or is given in within a reasonable time after notice of them is received. NY § (2) (a) - (c) ; see also Bayway

9

Supp . (S.D . N.Y . 2007)

UCC Section 2- 104

Orders .

Orders

Orders.

See UCC

Supp .

A . O . N . Y . S .

10 Ref., 215 F . 3d at 223 ; Colorado-Arkansas-Texas Distrib . v . Am . Eagle Food Prods . , Inc., 525 F . 2d 428 , Here , there is no dispute that both parti es were merchants . Further , none of the exceptions to would invali date the express terms of the Purchase None of the exceptions apply because : (a) the offer did not limit acceptance ; (b) the Purchase did not materially alter the terms of the bargain; and (c) there was no notification within a reasonable time by Tian Long of a problem with the terms in



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

the Purchase

Terms included in a confirmatory memoranda , such as a purchase order , between the parties intended to be a final written expression of their agreement may not be contradicted by written or oral communications between the parties made prior to or contemporaneous such a confirmatory memoranda . NY CLS 2-202 ; Polygram , SA. v. 32093 Enterprises , Inc., 697 F . 132 , 135 (E.D.N.Y . 1988) (holding invoices were a final written expression of the parties ' agreement and could not be contradicted by extrinsic or parole evidence) ; Battista v . Radesi , 112 2d 42 , 491 2d 81 (4th Dep ' t 1985) (same). In this case , there are clear confirmatory memoranda for each transaction in the form of the purchase orders . Therefore ,

See CLS UCC

Oakley 09 2010 U.S . LEXIS

2010)

UCC 2-207

Orders Order

See CLS UCC 2010 U. S. LEXIS

2000 30 no emails, phone calls , or other contradictory evidence can invalidate the express terms of the purchase orders .

The Court , however, may consider usage of trade to explain or supplement the terms in a confirmatory document , including Incoterms such as DDP . NY 2- 202(a); see also Hagrpota v. Trading Distrib . , Ltd. v . Fertilizer, Inc . , Civ . 9779, Dist. 62039, at *12-13 (S.D . N.Y. Jun . 18 , (interpreting incotelms expressly incorporated into a confirmatory document under and finding those terms binding on the parties) .

Tian Long retained the Purchase without objection, and every Purchase sent by Fashi on Avenue included the term DDP. As such, the DDP Incoterms were included as a binding term in every sales contract between the parties (i.e . the Purchase Orders) . NY § 2-207 ; see also Hagrpota , Dist . at *18 - 19 (finding parties were bound to an arbitration clause contained in Incoterms where those terms were included in most of confirmatory purchase orders sent over the course of two years) .

11

On



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

DDP

Orders " FA TO PAY 50% " FA

PAY 50 % Order

Orders

Tian Long has argued that in addition to the express confirmations to pay air freight , there were additional Purchase

as to which "my expectation and intent at the time of contracting with Fashion Avenue was that where expedited air shipment was requested, Fashion Avenue would pay for all or at least half of the shipping costs" . (Gao Affid . 28) . This

12

DDP

Of

\$40 , 567.08

Order assertion fails to establish an agreement to modify the Incoterm .

Tian Long claims that Fashion Avenue is responsible for 59 air shipments amounting to \$712,751 . 30 in damages . (Gao Deel. 13 .) However , Tian Long admits that of those 59 shipments , Fashion Avenue only agreed to pay for the shipping in 17 instances . (Gao Deel . 14 .) those 17 , Tian Long admits that Fashion Avenue did in fact pay for half of the shipping costs in 14 of the cases . (Gao Deel . 15 .) That means that there are only three of 59 total transactions in dispute . Those three Purchase Orders: 52227 , 52129 and 52232 , amount to

in costs , which is the only amount actually at issue in this motion . (Gao Deel. 16 .) Fashion Avenue submitted evidence that it already paid for the air shipping costs in association with one of the bills (Purchase 52232). (Hollandsworth Reply Deel., Exs . H, I .) While Fashion Avenue claims that it did not agree by email or on the actual purchase orders to pay for air shipping in connection with the other two transactions , Tian Long has created a disputed issue of material fact with respect to



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

Purchase Orders 52227 and 52129 .

13

DDP

Conditions." Condition

Orders

07 Civ. 2009 U.S. LEXIS 54670, 2009)

Cir. 2008)).

Cir. 2010). Tian Long attempts to raise an issue of fact by claiming the parties only contemplated the Incoterms would apply to shipments made by sea and points to one of ten items listed under "Terms & The specific & Term Tian Long references required that "[a]ll packing lists must be submitted within 48 hours after ship sailed." (Opposition, p. 6.) Based on this provision, Tian Long argues that the Purchase were ambiguous regarding what party was to pay air freight, but this term does not create any ambiguity.

Ambiguity is "defined in terms of whether a reasonably intelligent person viewing the contract objectively could interpret the language in more than one way." *Atateks Foreign Trade Ltd. v. Private Label Sourcing, LLC*, 6665,

Dist. at *12-13 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 23, (quoting *Topps Co., Inc. v. Cadbury Stani S.A.I.C.*, 526 F.3d 63, 68 (2d "No ambiguity exists where the contract language has 'a definite and precise meaning, unattended by danger of misconception in the purport of the [contract] itself, and concerning which there is not reasonable basis for a difference of opinion." *Id.* (quoting *Law Debenture Trust Co. of N.Y. v. Maverick Tube Corp.*, 595 F.3d 458, 467 (2d "Thus, the court should not find the contract ambiguous where

14 •

meaning. "'

See *United 403*, 1001).

" sequence

conduct. " CLS UCC "Proof ' l



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

the interpretation urged by one party would 'strain[] the contract language beyond its reasonable and ordinary meaning. *Debuture Trust Co. of N.Y.*, 595 F.3d at 467 (quoting *Bethlehem Steel Co. v. Turner Constr. Co.*, 2 N.Y.2d 456, 459 (1957)). Here, it would strain the contract beyond its ordinary meaning to say that the entire contract was ambiguous and the DDP Incoterm does not apply simply because one of the terms refers to when packing lists must be sent to the other party. That the packing lists refer to when the ship sails, does not invalidate the DDP term as the two refer to different parts of the contract. No reasonably intelligent person would interpret these terms in any other way. That a text is complex or imperfect does not mean it is ambiguous. *Aramony v. Way of Am.*, 254 F.3d 411 (2d Cir.).

Tian Long argues that there was a general course of dealing that Fashion Avenue would pay for half of the shipping in each instance in which they asked for shipping by air to meet a deadline. However, this is not the case. A course of dealing is a of previous conduct between parties which is fairly to be regarded as establishing a common basis of understanding for interpreting their expressions and other

NY § 1-205. of such conduct is limited

15

Orders

See CLS UCC

360, 2013)

Orders to objective facts as distinguished from oral statements of agreement. *Eskimo Pie Corp. v. Whitelawn Dairies, Inc.*, 284 F.Supp. 987, 992 (S.D.N.Y. 1968). In this case, the conduct between the parties falls short of course of dealing because Fashion Avenue only paid for invoices for which it expressly agreed to pay and marked the Purchase as such.

Even where there is a course of dealing the Court may not consider such facts for the purpose of contradicting the express terms of an agreement. NY § 2-208(2); *Christiana General v. Great American Ins. Co.*, 979 F.2d 268, 274 (2d Cir. 1992) (finding that when they are clear, the express terms of the agreement control over the parties course of dealing); see also *Meda AB v. 3M Co.*, 969 F.Supp.2d 378 (S.D.N.Y. (if a contract is not ambiguous the Court may not consider extrinsic evidence, including the parties course of dealing.)) In this case, the express terms of the agreement and the Purchase are clear and therefore govern the conduct of the parties. There is no established course of dealing to warrant requiring Fashion Avenue to pay for all or half of the air shipping in this case.



Tian Long Fashion Co., LTD v. Fashion Avenue Sweater Knits, LLC

2016 | Cited 0 times | S.D. New York | July 25, 2016

Conclusion

16

Order s

Orders Defendant ' s motion for partial summary judgment is granted in part to the extent that Tian Long is responsible for all shipping costs (including air shipping) , except for Purchase

as to which Fashion Avenue explicitly agreed to pay air freight . However, Defendant ' s motion is denied as to whether payment was made for the air freight on Purchase 52227 and 52129 because it remains a disputed issue of material fact whether Fashion Avenue agreed to pay for air freight with respect to those two orders .

17 •

')..., (2016

U.S.D.J. . .

It is so ordered.

New York, NY July ,

1 8

