



**Christina D. Horvath, as Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph J. Horvath, Also
Known as Joseph Horvath, Jr., et al., Appellants, v L & B Gardens, Inc., et al.,
Respondents, et al., Defendants. (Index No. 3545/07)**

2010-08459

**SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION, SECOND
DEPARTMENT**

**89 A.D.3d 803; 932 N.Y.S.2d 184; 2011 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 8010; 2011 NY Slip Op
8124**

November 9, 2011, Decided

PRIOR HISTORY: *Horvath v. L & B Gardens*, 29 Misc
3d 1211A, 2010 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 4997 (2010)

Gardens, for summary judgment dismissing the
complaint insofar as asserted against them.

HEADNOTES

Employment Relationships--Respondeat
Superior--Vicarious Liability--Intentional Tort

COUNSEL: [***1] Godosky & Gentile, P.C., New
York, N.Y. (David Godosky, Diane K. Toner, and
William Gentile of counsel), for appellants.

Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP, New York, N.Y.
(Gregory S. Katz, Jennifer Oxman, and Nicholas P.
Hurzeler of counsel), for respondents.

JUDGES: REINALDO E. RIVERA, J.P., RANDALL T.
ENG, ARIEL E. BELEN, LEONARD B. AUSTIN, JJ.
RIVERA, J.P., ENG, BELEN and AUSTIN, JJ., concur.

OPINION

[*803] [**184] In an action to recover damages
for personal injuries and wrongful death, the plaintiffs
appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Kings
County (Schmidt, J.), dated June 29, 2010, which granted
the motion of the defendants L & B Gardens, Inc., and L
& B Gardens, Inc., doing business as L & B Spumoni

Ordered that the order is affirmed, with costs.

[**185] This action arises from a physical
altercation between the plaintiff John Kolompar and
Joseph J. Horvath, the deceased brother of the plaintiff
Christina D. Horvath, on one side, and on the other side,
several employees of the defendants L & B Gardens, Inc.,
and L & B Gardens, Inc., doing business as L & B
Spumoni Gardens (hereinafter together L & B), a
restaurant [***2] in Brooklyn, New York.

Pursuant to the doctrine of respondeat superior, an
employer can be held vicariously liable for torts
committed by an employee acting within the scope of
employment (*see Fernandez v Rustic Inn, Inc.*, 60 AD3d
893, 896, 876 NYS2d 99 [2009], citing *Judith M. v
Sisters of Charity Hosp.*, 93 NY2d 932, 933, 715 NE2d
95, 693 NYS2d 67 [1999]). Pursuant to the doctrine, an
"employer may be liable when the employee acts
negligently or intentionally, so long as the tortious
conduct is generally foreseeable and a natural incident of
the employment" (*Judith M. v Sisters of Charity Hosp.*,
93 NY2d at 933). However, "liability will not attach for
torts committed by an employee who is acting solely for
personal motives unrelated to the furtherance of the

89 A.D.3d 803, *803; 932 N.Y.S.2d 184, **185;
2011 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 8010, ***2; 2011 NY Slip Op 8124

employer's business" (*Fernandez v Rustic Inn, Inc.*, 60 AD3d at 896).

Here, the evidence relied upon by L & B in support of its motion was sufficient to establish, prima facie, that L & B could not be held vicariously liable for its employees' intentional torts [*804] under the theory of respondeat superior. L & B's submissions demonstrated that the altercation took place away from its premises after L & B had closed for the evening, and that the altercation arose from personal motives unrelated [***3] to the furtherance of L & B's business interests (*see Schuhmann v McBride*, 23 AD3d 542, 542-543, 804

NYS2d 779 [2005]; *see also Fernandez v Rustic Inn, Inc.*, 60 AD3d at 896-897; *Savarese v City of N.Y. Hous. Auth.*, 172 AD2d 506, 508, 567 NYS2d 855 [1991]). In opposition, the plaintiffs failed to raise a triable issue of fact.

Accordingly, the Supreme Court properly granted L & B's motion for summary judgment dismissing the complaint insofar as asserted against it. Rivera, J.P., Eng, Belen and Austin, JJ., concur. **[Prior Case History: 29 Misc 3d 1211(A), 2010 NY Slip Op 51795(U).]**