

Tang v New York City Tr. Auth.

55 A.D.3d 720, 867 N.Y.S.2d 453, 2008 N.Y. Slip Op. 07903

Appellate Division, Second Department · October 14, 2008

Text of the decision from New York State Law Reporting Bureau (official slip opinion):
https://www.nycourts.gov/reporter/3dseries/2008/2008_07903.htm

Bracketed red numbers such as [55 AD3d 721] mark where each page of the official reporter begins, so you can cite a passage the same way a court does. Gray markers such as [*2] are the slip opinion's own page markers.

Court opinions are in the public domain. This copy is provided as a public service by Matthew L. Berman, matthewlberman.com. Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. This is general information, not legal advice. Reproduced without editorial changes; page markers added.

Tang v New York City Tr. Auth. 2008 NY Slip Op 07903 [55 AD3d 720] October 14, 2008 Appellate Division, Second Department Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431.

As corrected through Wednesday, December 10, 2008

Kim Tang, Appellant, v New York City Transit Authority et al., Respondents.

—[55 AD3d 720] [*1] K.C. Okoli, New York, N.Y., for appellant.

Richard Schoolman, Brooklyn, N.Y., for respondents.

In an action, inter alia, pursuant to Administrative Code of the City of New York § 8-107 (7) to recover damages for retaliation, the plaintiff appeals from so much of an order of the Supreme Court, Kings County (Knipel, J.), dated May 22, 2007, as granted the defendants' motion pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (7) to dismiss the amended complaint.

Ordered that the order is reversed insofar as appealed from, on the law, with costs, and the defendants' motion pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (7) to dismiss the amended complaint is denied.

The Supreme Court should not have granted the defendants' motion pursuant to CPLR 3211 (a) (7) to dismiss the amended complaint in this action, inter alia, pursuant to Administrative Code § 8-107 (7) to recover damages for retaliation. Contrary to the defendants' contention, Public Authorities Law § 1266 (8) does not exempt the New York City Transit Authority (hereinafter the Transit Authority) from all local laws affecting its activities and operations, but rather, only those "conflicting with this title or any rule or regulation" of the Transit Authority. Thus, "[i]t would then appear that the Legislature did not intend to prohibit the application of all local laws to the [Transit Authority], but only of such laws that interfered with the accomplishment of its transportation purposes" (*Bogdan v New York City Tr. Auth.*, 2005 WL 1161812, *4-5, 2005 US Dist LEXIS 9317, *15-16 [2005]). Compliance with the provisions in the Administrative Code against employment discrimination would not [55 AD3d 721] interfere with the function and purpose of the Transit Authority (see *Matter of Levy v City Commn. on Human Rights*, 85 NY2d 740, 745 [1995]; *Terranova v New York City Tr. Auth.*, 49 AD3d 10, 14-15 [2007]; *Huerta v New York City Tr. Auth.*, [*2]290 AD2d 33, 39 [2001]). Skelos, J.P., Fisher, Dickerson and Belen, JJ., concur. [See 16 Misc 3d 703.]