## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department

315

CA 08-01956

PRESENT: MARTOCHE, J.P., CENTRA, CARNI, AND GORSKI, JJ.

P. MARC SAMPSON, PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,

V

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

RAINBOW FORD LINCOLN MERCURY, INC., DEFENDANT-APPELLANT-RESPONDENT, DANIEL LANG, DEFENDANT-RESPONDENT, ET AL., DEFENDANT.

\_\_\_\_\_

RAINBOW FORD LINCOLN MERCURY, INC., THIRD-PARTY PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT-RESPONDENT,

V

P. MARC SAMPSON, DOING BUSINESS AS SAMPSON AUTO SALES, THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT-RESPONDENT-APPELLANT.

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP, ALBANY (DOUGLAS R. KEMP OF COUNSEL), FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT-RESPONDENT AND THIRD-PARTY PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT-RESPONDENT.

CHELUS, HERDZIK, SPEYER & MONTE, P.C., BUFFALO (MICHAEL F. CHELUS OF COUNSEL), FOR THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT-RESPONDENT-APPELLANT.

JOHN J. FLAHERTY, WILLIAMSVILLE, FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT.

GIBSON, MCASKILL & CROSBY, LLP, BUFFALO (NORMAN B. VITI, JR., OF COUNSEL), FOR DEFENDANT-RESPONDENT.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appeal and cross appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Cattaraugus County (Larry M. Himelein, A.J.), entered December 5, 2007 in a personal injury action. The order denied the motion of defendant-third-party plaintiff for summary judgment and denied the motion of third-party defendant for summary judgment.

It is hereby ORDERED that the order so appealed from is unanimously affirmed without costs.

Memorandum: We affirm for reasons stated in the decision at Supreme Court. We write only to note that the contention of defendant-third-party plaintiff that Workers' Compensation Law § 29 (6) bars plaintiff's action against it is raised for the first time on appeal, and we therefore do not consider it (see Oram v Capone, 206

AD2d 839, 840).

Entered: March 20, 2009