



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

OF

-

N)'SCEF 14-21, ~e

; '

CPLR

pur~uant FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

1 of 8 ..

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS, PART 73

-----X AVROHOM MORDECHAI COHEN, and
YITZCHOK LEIB MALLACH, as Members of Congregation Ohr Yisroel, Inc., Plaintiffs, -against-

CHAIM LANDAU, CONGREGATION OHR YISROEL INC., and JOHN DOES NOS 1 THROUGH 6 being the Members of the Board Of Trustees of Congregation Ohr Yisroel Inc., Defend.ants.

-----X Index No.: 533082/21 Motion Dates:

2-28-22 Mot. Seq. No.: 2, 3, 4

DECISION/ORDER

Upon the following e-filed documents, listed by as item numbers 23-37, 46-48, 50-53, the motions decided as follows:

By Notice of Motion dated January 20, 2022, defendant Chaim Landau moved for an order: 1) Pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a)(l) and (3) dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint in its entirety; and 2) granting other and further relief as this-Court deems just and proper (Motion Seq. No. 2).



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

By separate Notice of Motion dated January 21, 2022, defendants Congregation Ohr Yisroel, Inc. and its Trustees, except for Trustee Chaim Landau, also moved for an order dismissing the Complaint pursuant to CPLR Section 3211 (a)(l) and (3). In the alternative, these movants seek to compel arbitration before Rabbi Moshe Fogiel, pursuant to Section 7503 (Motion Seq. No. 3).

By Order to Show Cause dated January 26, 2022, plaintiffs, Avrohom Mordechai Cohen, and Yitzchok Leib Mallach, as Members of Congregation Ohr Yisroel Inc., moved for an order (i) to CPLR 6301, pending the entry of a final judgment in this Action, enjoining defendant Chaim Landau, as the purported President of the Congregation Ohr Yisroel, Inc. (the "Congregation"), and the Congregation, from taking any action to pay any funds of the Congregation with respect to a mortgage or with respect to the purported indebtedness underlying the mortgage; and (ii) pursuant to CPLR 3102 and 3107 directing defendant Landau to appear for a deposition to explain the circumstances surrounding the alleged execution and

1

[* 1] as seeking, mortgage (Which New Property") 15,

. never (or filed

obtained .

relief

. plaintiff-, "" is

"Membership", FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

2 of 8 delivery of the Purported Mortgage and the Alleged Underlying Indebtedness (Motion Seq. No. 4). The three motions are consolidated for disposition.

Background:

On December 27, 2021, the plaintiffs, Avrohom Mordechai Cohen and Yitzchok Leib Mallach, alleged members of the Congregation, commenced this action the cancellation of a \$5.7 million had been placed on the Congregation's real property located at 5002 19th Avenue, Brooklyn, York ("the Shul" in favor of defendant Chaim Landau, the mortgagee ("the mortgage"). The mortgage is dated April 2019 but was not filed until December 7, 2021. The mortgage refers to a note that was allegedly signed by the Congregation which, according to the recital in the mortgage, matured and became immediately due and payable on April 15, 2021. The plaintiffs contend that the mortgage is a sham.



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

They contend that the membership of the Congregation was advised of the mortgage or loan transaction in 2019 at any time thereafter) and that the mortgage was only after a demand letter was transmitted to Landau and the Congregation's Trustees challenging certain actions taken by Landau and the Trustees with respect to the operation of the Congregation. Plaintiffs further claim that the mortgage is invalid, as a matter of law, because the approval of the Attorney General or the Supreme Court was not for the transaction, as required by Religious Corporation Law § 12.

Defendants' Motions (Mot. Seq. Nos. 2 & 3):

Citing Religions Corporations Law § 5, the defendants maintain that only a trustee of a Religious Corporation may seek the plaintiffs are requesting. Since neither plaintiff is a trustee of the Congregation, the defendants contend that the action must be dismissed for lack of standing.,The defendants further maintain that even if the Court were to find that a member of a religious corporation may seek the relief the are requesting in their complaint, the action must be dismissed for lack of standing since neither plaintiff a member of the Congregation. The movants contend that the plaintiffs were never voted in as members pursuant to ARTICLE II of the Congregation's bylaws entitled which provides:

Membership Members of this organization will be its trustees and individuals who are accepted by the Trustees as members. An 2

[* 2] individiml in

Mayer

the ,

event not

intention

the extent issues arbitration, \Vi FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

3 of 8 shall not become a member unless so designated by a majority vote of the trustees, even if said individual participates in services and pays for a seat at the congregation. In the event that the trustees have not accepted any members, then the trustees alone shall be the members. 2/3 of the members constitute a quorum. Any matter for which a membership vote is necessary shall be decided by a 51 % majority of the members present unless otherwise specified these articles.

Defendants submitted the affinnations of David Piekarski and Gelbart, two of the { current trustees



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

of the Congregation, who stated that neither plaintiff has been designated a legal member of the Congregation by a majority vote of trustees, nor voted in by a 51 % majority of the members. They further state that a vote related to their legal membersh_ip status never occurred.

Defendants further claim that the "First Amendment" precludes the court from deciding the issue of whether the plaintiffs are members of the corporation as the dispute involves religious matters.

Finally, the defendants contend that if the matter is not dismissed, the matter should be referred to arbitration pursuant to the Congregation's amended bylaws which provide:

1. Any and all disputes relating to the corporation, shall be submitted to arbitration to Rabbi Moshe Fogiel residing at 193 7 50th Street, Brooklyn, NY 11204. In the that Rabbi Fogiel is available, or declines for whatever reason to serve as arbitrator, Rabbi Moshe Fogiel shall select an alternative arbitrator.

2. In the event that any party shall challe'nge his/her/its obligation to submit a dispute to arbitration, then, in the event that a Court of competent jurisdiction rules that this arbitration clause is not enforceable against such individual, then it is the intention of the corporation to have the clause read as obligating arbitration to the extent allowed by law. It is the of the corporation that in the event that the Court invalidates this clause to some extent, this clause should not be ineffective, or make this amendment ineffective. This clause should be read as obligating arbitration to allowed by law in accordance with the rulings of courts of competent jurisdiction. Furthermore, all related to where no court has ruled that they arc not arbitrable, arc thin the exclusive jurisdiction of the arbitrator, and this jurisdiction shall include any and all prearbitration remedies.

3

[* 3] plaintiffs i

of paying that Court \whether of the neutral Court's matter

Fogiet' _as bylmvs, plaintiffs allO\ving f an Board Trustees

ground Oiat lack prirna fade, pluintiffs as a malter (see J

The may seek tbe complaint.

oC

Arbiltier, stapding plaintiffs "in FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

4 of 8 In opposition to the motions, the submitted affirmations stating that they are indeed members of the Congregation. To further support their contention that they are members, they submitted a copy of the Congregation's membership list, which lists them as members. They also submitted copies statements provided to them by the Congregation documenting that they have been monthly membership dues. Plaintiffs further contend they can decide the issue of they are members Congregation by applying principles of law and that the adjudication of the would not violate the First Amendment.

With respect to defendants' contention that if the matter is not dismissed, the matter must be referred to Rabbi rvtoshe for arbitration, required by the Congregation's contend that Rabbi Moshe ogiel to arbitrate the matter, or even to select alternative arbitrator, would be grossly unfair since he presently sits on the of of the Congregation and is being sued in the action.

Discussion:

The Standing Issue:

To prevail on their motion to dismiss the action on the the plaintiffs standing, the defendants had the burden establish, that the lack of standing of law Cen!ar lanzbon1, 168 A.D.3d 670,671, 90 N.Y.S.3d 285; Deutsche Bank Co. v. 163 A.D.3d 523, 80 N.Y.S.3d 409). The defendants have not met this burden.

Court rejects defendant's contention but only a trustee of the Congregation relief that plaintiffs demand in their The case law fully supports plaintiffs contention that members of Religious Corporations may also seek such relief (see Kroth v. Congregation Che bra Ukadisha Bnai Israel, 105 Misc.2d 904 [holding that members a synagogue had standing to challenge the proposed sale of the synagogue's property]; Loren v. 2016 WL 5958103 [holding that a member in good standing of a congregation had to challenge legality of action taken by the board]). As counsel points out in his opposition, those cases where the courts have denied standing to a party to challenge the

4

[* 4] of i\4. onsey. not-a Matter tp respondent...t~ey

~ecisions

the

averring

plaintiffs



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

arbitrator Ap.2d 539; A.0:2d 530,

\. FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

5 of 8 sale of the organization's property, that was only because the court found that the plaintiff was, on the facts of those cases, not a valid member of the corporation" (see, e.g., Cong. Beth Midrash Inc. v. Rolling Acres Chestnut Ridge, LLC, 101 A.D.3d 797 ["since Empire is member of the plaintiff, it lacks standing to challenge the alleged statutory violation 11); of Bridge Spiritual Freedom, Inc., 304 A.D.2d 574 (since "appellants were not members of the therefore could not object to the sale of the subject property"); Agudas Chadidei Chabad v. Cong. Lubavitch, Inc., 67 Misc.3d 1214(A) ["the parishioners are not members of the religious corporation [so] lack standing to challenge [made by the trustees] concerning the transfer of the corporation's property made by the five member board of trustees"])).

Clearly, the defendants have not established as a matter of law that the plaintiffs are not members of the Congregation. While defendants submitted the affirmations of two of the Congregation's current trustees who state that the plaintiffs were never voted in as members, as required by the bylaws, the plaintiffs made a strong showing in opposition to the motion that they are indeed members of the Congregation. The plaintiffs submitted affirmations to the fact that they are numbers and supported their contention with a copy of the Congregation membership list, listing them as members, and submitting copies of statements provided to them by the Congregation that they have been paying membership dues. Whether the plaintiffs are members of the Congregation present triable issues of fact.

The Arbitration Issue:

Clearly, since Rabbi Moshe Fogiel is a current trustee of the Congregation (see NYSCEF Doc. # 41) and is being sued by the as a trustee, it would be fundamentally unfair to allow him to arbitrate the issue of whether plaintiffs are members of the Congregation as the bylaws require. For the same reason, it would be fundamentally unfair to allow him to select an alternate arbitrator.

In appropriate circumstances, such as here, the Court may disqualify an from arbitrating a dispute (see, Rabinowitz v. Olewski, 100 540,473 N. Y.S.2d 232; Matter of Excelsior 57th Corp. (Kern), 218 528, 630 N.Y.S.2d 492,494). The proper standard of review for the disqualification of an arbitrator "is whether the arbitration



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

· N.Y.S.2d is·

·

T~e

v. N. Uf.iled 2372, re~olving parties

N;Y.2d B'nai 664_N.Y.S.2d Wolj; Tpe app:oach ' reference N.Y2d v. 108, D',5atmar, Here, there lS
thatthe FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO.
54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

6 of 8 process is free of the appearance of of Excelsior 57th Corp. (Kern), 218 A.D.2d 528,530,630
492,494; quoting Rabinowitz v. 100 A.D.2d 539, 540, 473 N.Y.S.2d 232; citing Commonwealth Corp. v.
Continental Co., 393 U.S. 145, 89 S.Ct. 21 L.Ed.2d 301). Bias must be clearly apparent based upon
established facts, and not merely _ supported by unproved and disputed assertions (Bronx-Lebanon
Hosp. Center v. Signature Medical Management Group, L.L.C. 6 A.D.3d 261,261, 775 279,280). Here,
since the, Congregation's bylaws list Rabbi Moshe Fogiel as a current trustee of the Congregation,
there no doubt there would be an appearance of bias if the arbitration provision is enforced. For
these reasons, he cannot a arbitrate the matter or select an alternate arbitrator.

The First Amendment Issue:

defendants have not demonstrated that the First, Amendment precludes the Court from adjudicating
the issue of whether the plaintiffs are members of the Congregation. The First ' Amendment only
forbids civil courts from interfering in or determining religious disputes when the there is
"substantial danger that the state will become entangled in essentially religious controversies or
intervene on behalf of groups espousing particular doctrines or beliefs" (Congregation Yetev Lev
D'Satmar, Inc. Kahana, 9 Y.3d 282, 286, 879 N.E.2d 1282, 1284; citing Serbian Eastern Orthodox
Diocese for States and Canada v. Milivojevich, 426 U.S. 696, 96 S.Ct. 49 L.Ed.2d 151). The First
Amendment does not bar the Court from civil disputes involving religious or institutions, where,
such disputes can be resolved by applying neutral principles of law (see First Presbyt. Church of
Schenectady v. United Presbyt. Church in US. of Am., 62 110,476 N.Y.S.2d 86,464 N.E.2d 454; Park
Slope Jewish Ctr. v. Congregation Jacob, 90 N.Y.2d 517,521, 236,686 N.E.2d 1330, citing Jones v. 443
U.S. 595, 99 S.Ct. 3020, 61 L.Ed.2d 775). "neutral principles of law" requires the court to apply
objective, well-established principles of secular law to the issues without to any religious principle
(see First Presbyt. Church, 62 at 119--120, 476 N.Y.S.2d 86,464 N.E.2d 454; Avitzur Avitzur, 58 N.Y.2d
115, 459 N. Y.S.2d 572, 446 N.E.2d 136 [1983]; Congregation Yetev Lev Inc. v. ' . . Kahana, 9 N.Y.3d
282,286,879 N.E.2d 1282, 1284--85). nothing in the record even suggesting issue of whether the
plaintiffs are members of the Congregation cannot be decided by applying neutral principles of law.



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

6

[* 6] ~I~, Preliminary

'To

Bais Yosef,

se-e v. yvfount Baptist ChLrch 023, "the render

Yosef, "[t]he ~ill ground~ v. Prc;p.,

if are there the seek tlieir

order .~fard

v.

Arcamone-Afakinano, supra). and balance plaintiffs' \Voti!d quo FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022 INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

7 of 8 Plaintiff's Motion for a Injunction:

be entitled to a preliminary injunction, a movant must establish (1) a probability of success on the merits, (2) a danger of irreparable injury in the absence of an injunction, and (3) a balance of the equities in the movant's favor" (Congregation Erech Shai Inc. v. Werzberger, 189 A.D.3d 1165, 1166-1167, 138 N.Y.S.3d 542 [internal quotation marks omitted]; GC Acquisitions, LLC Olive ofManhasset, 178 A.D.3d 11024, 116 N. Y.S.3d 303). Where, as here, denial of a preliminary injunction would disturb the status quo and the final judgment ineffectual, the degree of proof required to I establish the element of likelihood of success on the merits should be reduced" (Congregation Erech Shai Bais Inc. v. Werzberger, 189 A.D.3d at 1167, 138 N.Y.S.3d 542 [internal quotation marks omitted]). Significantly, mere existence of an issue of fact not itself be for the denial of the motion" (Arcamone-Makinano Britton Inc., 83 A.D.3d at 625, 920 N. Y.S.2d 362).

Applying these principles, it is determined that the plaintiffs members of the Congregation, is little doubt that they would be entitled to relief they in complaint. Religious Corporation Law§ 12(1) provides that "a religiou.s corporation shall not sell, mortgage or lease for a term exceeding five years any of its real property without applying for and obtaining leave of the court or of the attorney general therefor ... " (emphasis supplied). Significantly, the defendants are not disputing that they failed to obtain the consents required by Religious Corporation Law§ 12(1) in to mortgage the Shul property. Such failure renders the mortgage "invalid" (sec Congregation Nachlas Jacob Anshe



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

of Jackson Heights v. Schwarz, 152 A.D.3d 647, 55 N.Y.S.3d 913; Wiggs v. Williams, 36 A.D.3d 570, 571, 828 N.Y.S.2d 397; Matter of Agudist Council of Greater N. Y. Imperial Sales Co., 158 A.D.2d 683, - 551 N.Y.S.2d 955).

While it is true that triable of fact exist as to whether plaintiffs have standing, this alone does not require denial of the motion (see Considering plaintiffs' strong showing that they are members of the Congregation the almost undeniable fact that the mortgage is invalid, a of the equities is in plaintiffs' favor. Denying motion for a preliminary injunction disturb the status and possibly render the final

7

[* 7] . _ itieffectua!. GRANTED

it

the

1t

of tbe

'Nithout

ORDERED that discovet)'

.

21,

'---' r~c i,1 :~: ::,~ (~ } --< --'"-----~ i.O ., . -~- ,,,, FILED: KINGS COUNTY CLERK 06/29/2022
INDEX NO. 533082/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 54 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/05/2022

8 of 8 I •

judgment Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction is to the extent indicated below.

For all of he above reasons, is hereby

ORDERED that those branches of defendants' motions to dismiss the action on the ground that plaintiffs lack standing is DENIED; it is further



Cohen v Landau

2022 NY Slip Op 32124(U) (2022) | Cited 0 times | New York Supreme Court | June 21, 2022

ORDERED that those branches of defendants' motions to dismiss the action on ground that the First Amendment precludes the Court from adjudicating this matter is DENIED; it is further

ORDERED that those branches of defendants' motion to compel arbitration arc DENIED, is further

ORDERED plaintiffs motion for a preliminary injunction is GRANTED to the extent that the defendants are enjoined from taking any action to pay any funds Congregation ,with respect to the mortgage or with respect to the purported indebtedness underlying the mortgage prior Court approval; and it is further

that branch of plaintiffs' motion seeking is GRANTED to the extent that the parties are to appear in CCP on July 30, 2022, for a discovery conference.

This constitutes the decision and order of the Court.

Dated: June 2022

8 PETERP. SWEENEY, J.S.C. ..

Note: This signature was generated electronically pursuant to Administrative Order 86/20 dated April 20, 2020

[* 8]

