

109 A.D.3d 817, *; 971 N.Y.S.2d 147, **;
2013 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 5765, ***; 2013 NY Slip Op 5816

**In the Matter of Board of Education of Hauppauge Union Free School District,
respondent, v Michael P. Hogan, appellant. (Index No. 23632-11)**

2012-02702

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

**109 A.D.3d 817; 971 N.Y.S.2d 147; 2013 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 5765; 2013 NY
Slip Op 5816**

September 11, 2013, Decided

NOTICE:

THE LEXIS PAGINATION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE PENDING RELEASE OF THE FINAL PUBLISHED VERSION. THIS OPINION IS UNCORRECTED AND SUBJECT TO REVISION BEFORE PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

CASE SUMMARY:

OVERVIEW: HOLDINGS: [1]-The arbitration award at issue was a final determination subject to review under CPLR 7511 because it dismissed the most serious disciplinary charge preferred against a teacher, which alleged that he was guilty of misconduct; [2]-The charge at issue was not barred on its face by the three-year limitations period in Education Law § 3020-a because sufficiently charged conduct that, if proven, would constitute the crime of second-degree offering a false instrument for filing under Penal Law § 175.30 by alleging that the teacher knowingly presented a false employment application to the school district by omitting the fact that he had been a probationary teacher at another school district.

OUTCOME: Order affirmed.

CORE TERMS: school district, employment application, misconduct, probationary teacher, disciplinary charges, arbitrary and capricious, reinstated, arbitrator's, knowingly, arbitration proceeding, guilty of misconduct, false instrument, sufficient facts, interlocutory, constituting, arbitration, offering, vacate

LexisNexis(R) Headnotes

Education Law > Faculty & Staff > Discipline & Dismissal > Timeliness

[HN1] Education Law § 3020-a(1) provides that no disciplinary charge may be brought more than three years after the occurrence of the alleged incompetency or misconduct, except when the charge is of misconduct constituting a crime when committed.

Civil Procedure > Alternative Dispute Resolution > Judicial Review

Civil Procedure > Appeals > Appellate Jurisdiction > Interlocutory Orders

Governments > Courts > Authority to Adjudicate

[HN2] As a general rule, a court lacks authority to entertain a petition to review an interlocutory ruling of an arbitrator on a procedural matter.

Civil Procedure > Alternative Dispute Resolution > Judicial Review

[HN3] Where an obligation to arbitrate arises through statutory mandate (Education Law § 3020-a), an arbitrator's determination is subject to closer judicial scrutiny than it would receive had the arbitration been conducted voluntarily.

Civil Procedure > Alternative Dispute Resolution > Arbitrations > General Overview

109 A.D.3d 817, *, 971 N.Y.S.2d 147, **;
2013 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 5765, ***; 2013 NY Slip Op 5816

Civil Procedure > Appeals > Standards of Review > Substantial Evidence > General Overview

[HN4] The award in a compulsory arbitration proceeding must have evidentiary support and cannot be arbitrary and capricious.

COUNSEL: [***1] Long, Tuminello, Besso, Seligman, Werner, Sullivan & Aulivola LLP, Bay Shore, N.Y. (Michelle Aulivola of counsel), for appellant.

Harris Beach PLLC, Uniondale, N.Y. (Warren H. Richmond of counsel), for respondent.

JUDGES: RANDALL T. ENG, P.J., RUTH C. BALKIN, SHERI S. ROMAN, ROBERT J. MILLER, JJ. ENG, P.J., BALKIN, ROMAN and MILLER, JJ., concur.

OPINION

[*817] [*148] DECISION & ORDER**

In a proceeding pursuant to CPLR article 75 and Education Law § 3020-a to vacate an arbitration award dated July 11, 2011, which granted Michael P. Hogan's motion to dismiss the first charge in a Statement of Charges preferred against him by the Board of Education of the Hauppauge Union Free School District, Michael P. Hogan appeals from an order of the Supreme Court, Suffolk County (Baisley, Jr., J.), dated January 19, 2012, which granted the petition and reinstated Charge No. 1 in the Statement of Charges.

ORDERED that the order is affirmed, with costs.

In May 2006, Michael P. Hogan submitted an application to the Hauppauge Union Free School District (hereinafter the District) seeking employment as a physical education teacher. In his application, which he certified to be true and complete, Hogan failed to disclose that he had previously [***2] held a probationary teaching position with another school district. The District claims that Hogan resigned from this previous position after allegations were made that he used corporal punishment and he was told that he would not receive tenure. In December 2010, [*818] the District preferred three disciplinary charges against Hogan pursuant to Education Law § 3020-a. Charge No. 1 alleged that Hogan was guilty of misconduct because he had presented an employment application to the District which was false because he knowingly omitted the fact that he had been a probationary teacher at another school district, and that Hogan presented the employment application with the knowledge or belief that it would be filed with the District. Charge No. 1 further alleged that this conduct was in violation of Penal Law § 175.30, which defines the crime of [***149] offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree.

Hogan subsequently moved to dismiss Charge No. 1, contending that it was time-barred by [HN1] Education Law § 3020-a, which provides that no disciplinary charge may be brought more than three years after the occurrence of the alleged incompetency or misconduct, "except when the charge is of misconduct [***3] constituting a crime when committed" (Education Law § 3020-a[1]). The hearing officer designated as arbitrator granted Hogan's motion, concluding that the District had failed to plead sufficient facts to establish that Hogan committed a violation of Penal Law § 175.30 by knowingly omitting his prior position as a probationary teacher from his employment application, and that the District could therefore not invoke the exception to the three-year limitations period that applies when the charged misconduct constitutes a crime. The District thereafter commenced this proceeding pursuant to CPLR article 75 and Education Law § 3020-a seeking to vacate the award dismissing Charge No. 1 on the ground that it was arbitrary and capricious, and lacked a rational basis. The Supreme Court granted the District's petition and reinstated Charge No. 1.

Initially, we reject Hogan's contention that the petition should have been dismissed because courts do not have the authority to review an interlocutory award dismissing one of the charges in an arbitration proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law 3020-a. [HN2] As a general rule, a court lacks authority to entertain a petition to review an interlocutory [***4] ruling of an arbitrator on a procedural matter (*see Mobil Oil Indonesia v Asamera Oil [Indonesia]*, 43 NY2d 276, 281, 372 N.E.2d 21, 401 N.Y.S.2d 186; *CSP Tech., Inc. v Hekal*, 57 AD3d 372, 869 N.Y.S.2d 449). Here, however, the award sought to be reviewed is not one which involves "only a very limited procedural question" (*Mobil Oil Indonesia v Asamera Oil [Indonesia]*, 43 NY2d at 281). Rather, the award dismissed the most serious disciplinary charge preferred against Hogan, and the only one of the three charges which alleged that he was guilty of misconduct. The award is final as to that charge, and, [*819] if allowed to stand, would prevent the District from adducing evidence in support of the alleged misconduct at the hearing. Under these

109 A.D.3d 817, *, 971 N.Y.S.2d 147, **;
2013 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 5765, ***; 2013 NY Slip Op 5816

circumstances, the award dismissing Charge No. 1 can be viewed as a final determination subject to review under CPLR 7511 (*but see Matter of Geneva City School Dist. v Anonymous*, 77 AD3d 1365, 908 N.Y.S.2d 506).

Furthermore, the Supreme Court properly granted the District's petition and reinstated Charge No. 1 against Hogan. [HN3] Where, as here, the obligation to arbitrate arises through statutory mandate (*see* Education Law § 3020-a), the arbitrator's determination is subject to closer judicial scrutiny than it would receive had [***5] the arbitration been conducted voluntarily (*see Matter of Powell v Board of Educ. of Westbury Union Free School Dist.*, 91 AD3d 955, 938 N.Y.S.2d 123; *Matter of Saunders v Rockland Bd. of Coop. Educ. Servs.*, 62 AD3d 1012, 1013, 879 N.Y.S.2d 568). [HN4] The award in a compulsory arbitration proceeding must have evidentiary support and cannot be arbitrary and capricious (*see City School Dist. of the City of N.Y. v McGraham*, 17 NY3d 917, 919, 958 N.E.2d 897, 934 N.Y.S.2d 768; *Matter of Denhoff v Mamaroneck Union Free School Dist.*, 101 AD3d 997, 998, 957 N.Y.S.2d 208; *Matter of Powell v Board of Educ. of Westbury Union Free School Dist.*, 91 AD3d at 955).

Applying that standard here, the determination that Charge No. 1 failed to plead sufficient facts to establish that Hogan [**150] committed a violation of Penal Law § 175.30 was arbitrary and capricious. Charge No. 1 sufficiently charged conduct which, if proven, would constitute the crime of offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree by alleging that Hogan presented an employment application to the District which was false because he knowingly omitted the fact that he had been a probationary teacher at another school district, and that Hogan presented the employment application with the knowledge or belief that it would [***6] be filed with the District (*see* Penal Law § 175.30; *Matter of Wilson v Town of Minerva Town Bd.*, 65 AD3d 788, 789, 883 N.Y.S.2d 738; *Matter of Dean v Bradford*, 158 AD2d 772, 775, 551 N.Y.S.2d 364). Since Charge No. 1 was sufficient to plead conduct constituting a crime, it was not barred on its face by the three-year limitations period (*see Matter of Wilson v Town of Minerva Town Bd.*, 65 AD3d at 789; *Matter of Tasch v Board of Educ. of City of N.Y.*, 3 AD3d 502, 503, 770 N.Y.S.2d 430).

ENG, P.J., BALKIN, ROMAN and MILLER, JJ., concur.