

**Supreme Court of the State of New York  
County of New York**

----- x

In the Matter of the Application of

LISA FLANZRAICH, BENAY WAITZMAN, LINDA WOOLVERTON, ED FERINGTON, MERRI TURK LASKY, PHYLLIS LIPMAN, on behalf of the themselves and others similarly situated, and the NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES, INC., on behalf of former New York City public service employees who are now Medicare-eligible Retirees,

Petitioners,

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Index No. 158815/2021

For a Judgment Pursuant to CPLR Article 78

- against -

RENEE CAMPION, as Commissioner of the City of New York Office of Labor Relations, CITY OF NEW YORK OFFICE OF LABOR RELATIONS, and THE CITY OF NEW YORK,

Respondents.

----- x

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that respondents appeal to the Appellate Division, First Department, from the decision and order of Supreme Court, New York County (Frank, J.) dated and entered on March 3, 2022 (NYSCEF Nos. 214–216).


/

/

/

Dated: New York, New York  
March 4, 2022

HON. SYLVIA O. HINDS-RADIX  
*Corporation Counsel  
of the City of New York*

By:   
DEVIN SLACK  
Deputy Chief, Appeals Division  
100 Church Street  
New York, New York 10007  
212-356-0817  
dslack@law.nyc.gov

To: POLLOCK COHEN LLP  
60 Broad St., 24th Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
212-337-5361  
scohen@pollockcohen.com

- and -

WALDEN MACHT & HARAN LLP  
250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor  
New York, NY 10281  
212-335-2965  
jgardener@wmhlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners*

# Supreme Court of the State of New York

## Appellate Division: First Judicial Department

Informational Statement (Pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1250.3 [a]) - Civil

**Case Title:** Set forth the title of the case as it appears on the summons, notice of petition or order to show cause by which the matter was or is to be commenced, or as amended.

In the Matter of the Application of LISA FLANZRAICH, BENAY WAITZMAN, LINDA WOOLVERTON, ED FERINGTON, MERRI TURK LASKY, PHYLLIS LIPMAN, on behalf of the themselves and others similarly situated, and the NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES, INC., on behalf of former New York City public service employees who are now Medicare-eligible Retirees, Petitioners,

For a Judgment Pursuant to CPLR Article 78

- against -

RENEE CAMPION, as Commissioner of the City of New York Office of Labor Relations, CITY OF NEW YORK OFFICE OF LABOR RELATIONS, and THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Respondents.

For Court of Original Instance

---

Date Notice of Appeal Filed

For Appellate Division

Case Type	Filing Type
<input type="checkbox"/> Civil Action <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR article 75 Arbitration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CPLR article 78 Proceeding <input type="checkbox"/> Special Proceeding Other <input type="checkbox"/> Habeas Corpus Proceeding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal <input type="checkbox"/> Original Proceedings <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR Article 78 <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent Domain <input type="checkbox"/> Labor Law 220 or 220-b <input type="checkbox"/> Public Officers Law § 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Real Property Tax Law § 1278 <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred Proceeding <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR Article 78 <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Law § 298 <input type="checkbox"/> CPLR 5704 Review

**Nature of Suit:** Check up to three of the following categories which best reflect the nature of the case.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Business Relationships	<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> Contracts
<input type="checkbox"/> Declaratory Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Relations	<input type="checkbox"/> Election Law	<input type="checkbox"/> Estate Matters
<input type="checkbox"/> Family Court	<input type="checkbox"/> Mortgage Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> Miscellaneous	<input type="checkbox"/> Prisoner Discipline & Parole
<input type="checkbox"/> Real Property (other than foreclosure)	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory	<input type="checkbox"/> Taxation	<input type="checkbox"/> Torts

Appeal	
Paper Appealed From (Check one only):	If an appeal has been taken from more than one order or judgment by the filing of this notice of appeal, please indicate the below information for each such order or judgment appealed from on a separate sheet of paper.
<input type="checkbox"/> Amended Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Amended Judgement <input type="checkbox"/> Amended Order <input type="checkbox"/> Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Decree	<input type="checkbox"/> Determination <input type="checkbox"/> Finding <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order <input type="checkbox"/> Order & Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettled Order <input type="checkbox"/> Ruling <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):
Court: <b>Supreme Court</b>	County: <b>New York</b>
Dated: <b>03/03/2022</b>	Entered: <b>03/03/2022</b>
Judge (name in full): <b>Hon. Lyle E. Frank</b>	Index No.: <b>158815/2021</b>
Stage: <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocutory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Final	Trial: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Jury <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Jury
Prior Unperfected Appeal and Related Case Information	
Are any appeals arising in the same action or proceeding currently pending in the court? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please set forth the Appellate Division Case Number assigned to each such appeal.	
Where appropriate, indicate whether there is any related action or proceeding now in any court of this or any other jurisdiction, and if so, the status of the case:	
Original Proceeding	
Commenced by: <input type="checkbox"/> Order to Show Cause <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of Habeas Corpus	Date Filed:
Statute authorizing commencement of proceeding in the Appellate Division:	
Proceeding Transferred Pursuant to CPLR 7804(g)	
Court: <b>Choose Court</b>	County: <b>Choose County</b>
Judge (name in full):	Order of Transfer Date:
CPLR 5704 Review of Ex Parte Order:	
Court: <b>Choose Court</b>	County: <b>Choose County</b>
Judge (name in full):	Dated:
Description of Appeal, Proceeding or Application and Statement of Issues	
<p>Description: If an appeal, briefly describe the paper appealed from. If the appeal is from an order, specify the relief requested and whether the motion was granted or denied. If an original proceeding commenced in this court or transferred pursuant to CPLR 7804(g), briefly describe the object of proceeding. If an application under CPLR 5704, briefly describe the nature of the ex parte order to be reviewed.</p> <p>By decision and order dated and entered March 3, 2022--in effect, a final judgment--Supreme Court, New York County (Frank, J.), (1) ordered that enrollment in the Medicare Advantage Plan cannot occur until April 1, 2022, and that retirees must be able to opt-out for at least three months from the effective date; (2) enjoined respondents from passing along any costs of the New York City retirees' current plan to the retiree or their dependents, except where such plan rises above the H.I.P.-H.M.O. threshold; and (3) directed respondents to ensure that all retirees and dependents pay the deductible for only one plan for the calendar year 2022.</p>	

Informational Statement - Civil

Issues: Specify the issues proposed to be raised on the appeal, proceeding, or application for CPLR 5704 review, the grounds for reversal, or modification to be advanced and the specific relief sought on appeal.

Did Supreme Court err in:

- (1) ordering that enrollment in the Medicare Advantage Plan cannot occur until April 1, 2022, and that retirees must be able to opt-out for at least three months from the effective date;
- (2) enjoining respondents from passing along any costs of the New York City retirees' current plan to the retiree or their dependents, except where such plan rises above the H.I.P.-H.M.O. threshold; and
- (3) directing respondents to ensure that all retirees and dependents pay the deductible for only one plan for the calendar year 2022?

### Party Information

Instructions: Fill in the name of each party to the action or proceeding, one name per line. If this form is to be filed for an appeal, indicate the status of the party in the court of original instance and his, her, or its status in this court, if any. If this form is to be filed for a proceeding commenced in this court, fill in only the party's name and his, her, or its status in this court.

No.	Party Name	Original Status	Appellate Division Status
1	LISA FLANZRAICH	Petitioner	Respondent
2	BENAY WAITZMAN	Petitioner	Respondent
3	LINDA WOOLVERTON	Petitioner	Respondent
4	ED FERINGTON	Petitioner	Respondent
5	MERRI TURK LASKY	Petitioner	Respondent
6	PHYLLIS LIPMAN	Petitioner	Respondent
7	NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES, INC.,	Petitioner	Respondent
8	RENEE CAMPION, as Commissioner of the City of New York Office of Labor Relations	Respondent	Appellant
9	CITY OF NEW YORK OFFICE OF LABOR RELATIONS	Respondent	Appellant
10	THE CITY OF NEW YORK	Respondent	Appellant
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

### Attorney Information

Instructions: Fill in the names of the attorneys or firms for the respective parties. If this form is to be filed with the notice of petition or order to show cause by which a special proceeding is to be commenced in the Appellate Division, only the name of the attorney for the petitioner need be provided. In the event that a litigant represents herself or himself, the box marked "Pro Se" must be checked and the appropriate information for that litigant must be supplied in the spaces provided.

Attorney/Firm Name: Pollock Cohen LLP

Address: 60 Broad St., 24th Floor

City: New York

State: NY

Zip: 10004

Telephone No: 212-337-5361

E-mail Address: scohen@pollockcohen.com

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 1-7

Attorney/Firm Name: Walden Macht & Haran LLP

Address: 250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor

City: New York, New York

State: NY

Zip: 10281

Telephone No: 212-335-2965

E-mail Address: jgardener@wmhlaw.com

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 1-7

Attorney/Firm Name: New York City Law Department

Address: 100 Church Street

City: New York

State: NY

Zip: 10007

Telephone No: 212-356-2500

E-mail Address: nycappeals@law.nyc.gov (for urgent matters, cc: dslack@law.nyc.gov and cplatt@law.nyc.gov)

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above): 8-10

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):

Attorney/Firm Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Telephone No:

E-mail Address:

Attorney Type:  Retained  Assigned  Government  Pro Se  Pro Hac Vice

Party or Parties Represented (set forth party number(s) from table above):

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: HON. LYLE E. FRANK PART 11M

Justice

-----X

NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES, INC, LISA FLANZRAICH, BENAY WAITZMAN, LINDA WOOLVERTON, ED FERINGTON, MERRI TURK LASKY, PHYLLIS LIPMAN,

Plaintiff,

INDEX NO. 158815/2021

10/21/2021, N/A,

MOTION DATE 02/22/2022

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001 002 004

- v -

RENEE CAMPION, CITY OF NY OFFICE OF LABOR RELATIONS, CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 212

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 002) 2, 57, 63, 64, 65, 79, 80, 81, 82, 96, 113, 166, 205, 206

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 208, 209, 210, 213

were read on this motion to/for SUMMARY JUDGMENT(AFTER JOINDER).

The underlying petition arises out of allegations that respondents have unlawfully amended the Medicare plan of current retirees.1 The Court previously held on October 21, 2021, that the selection of the Alliance to administer the proposed Medicare Advantage Plus Plan (the "Plan") was not arbitrary and capricious, however the implementation of the plan was irrational and many details of the plan required refinement. Based on that determination, the Court granted

1 It appears undisputed that the summary judgment motion by petitioners (seq. 4) was not legally permissible in this proceeding. However, due to the complexity of this case, the Court reviewed the papers submitted for seq. 4 as being incorporated to the 2 motion sequences that were proper: seq. 1, the order to show cause of which the preliminary injunction was derived, and seq. 2, the original petition, and the cross-motion to dismiss by respondents.

a preliminary injunction to allow respondents to clarify and make adjustments consistent with the Court's order.

The parties have since made multiple submissions and appearances before the Court; as a result, the preliminary injunction is now vacated, and the underlying petition is ripe for resolution. For the reasons set forth below, the petition is granted to the extent indicated below and respondents' motion to dismiss the petition is denied.

First, the respondent and nominal respondent have taken many strides to improve the information available regarding the Plan, and thus, while the steps they have taken may not make things perfect, the Court finds that at this point the implementation of the Medicare Advantage Plan is no longer what this Court would consider irrational.

Second, much of the legal arguments made by the petitioners are unavailing. The respondent was well within its right to work with the Municipal Labor Council to change how retirees get their health insurance. As the municipal labor unions are the entities that enter into collective bargaining agreements, those unions, through the umbrella Municipal Labor Council may amend those agreements. Moreover, even if the Court were to find the labor unions may not bind retirees, this would only mean that the respondents could act alone without the Municipal Labor Council, which nevertheless would still not invalidate the agreement that was reached here.

Third, as the petitioners freely acknowledge, the New York State Constitution does not guarantee specific health insurance for retirees.

However, based on this Court's reading of New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126, so long as the respondent is giving retirees the option of staying in their current program, they may not do so by charging them the \$191 the respondent intends to charge. This section



states unequivocally that “[t]he City will pay the entire cost of health insurance coverage for city employees, city retirees and their dependents, not to exceed one hundred percent of the full cost of H.I.P.-H.M.O. on a category basis.”<sup>2</sup> Respondent and nominal respondent aver that the definition of “health insurance coverage”, as defined in Admin. Code § 12-126 (a), stating “a program” as opposed to “any program” means that the City of New York need only pay for the entire cost of one program. This Court respectfully disagrees. NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) is simply unequivocal and does not use terms like “provide” or “offer”; rather it uses the term will pay and it provides parameters of such payment. The definition in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (a)(iv) simply provides what constitutes a program or plan that the City of New York is required by law to pay for, by defining the contents of such a plan. This Court holds that this is the only reasonable way of interpreting this section.

Of course, none of this is to say that the respondent must give retirees an option of plans, nor that if the plan goes above the threshold discussed in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) that the respondent could not pass along the cost above the threshold to the retiree; only that if there is to be an option of more than one plan, that the respondent may not pass any cost of the prior plan to the retirees, as it is the Court’s understanding that the threshold is not crossed by the cost of the retirees’ current health insurance plan. This is buoyed by the fact that the current plan has been paid for by the respondent in full to this point. Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED that the preliminary injunction previously put into place by this Court is lifted, except that:

1. Enrollment in the Medicare Advantage Plan may not occur until at least April 1, 2022, and that retirees shall have the option of opting out of the Medicare

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court refers to this below as the “threshold”.

Advantage Plan for not less than three months following the effective date of the Medicare Advantage Plan;

2. The respondent is permanently enjoined from passing along any costs of the New York City retirees' current plan to the retiree or to any of their dependents, except where such plan rises above the H.I.P.-H.M.O. threshold, as provided by New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126; and
3. The respondent shall ensure that all retirees and dependents of such retirees pay the deductible for only one plan for the calendar year 2022.

  
 20220303105510LFRANKB4A875C50D941B88150FAC1F30767E3

3/3/2022  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
LYLE E. FRANK, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:

CASE DISPOSED

GRANTED  DENIED

SETTLE ORDER

INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN

NON-FINAL DISPOSITION

GRANTED IN PART  OTHER

SUBMIT ORDER

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT  REFERENCE

APPLICATION:

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: HON. LYLE E. FRANK PART 11M

Justice

-----X

NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES,
INC, LISA FLANZRAICH, BENAY WAITZMAN, LINDA
WOOLVERTON, ED FERINGTON, MERRI TURK LASKY,
PHYLLIS LIPMAN,

Plaintiff,

INDEX NO. 158815/2021

10/21/2021,
N/A,

MOTION DATE 02/22/2022

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001 002 004

- v -

RENEE CAMPION, CITY OF NY OFFICE OF LABOR
RELATIONS, CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

DECISION + ORDER ON
MOTION

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 24, 25, 26, 27, 28,
29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58,
66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,
110, 111, 112, 212

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER .

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 002) 2, 57, 63, 64, 65, 79,
80, 81, 82, 96, 113, 166, 205, 206

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER .

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 185, 186, 187, 188,
189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 208, 209, 210, 213

were read on this motion to/for SUMMARY JUDGMENT(AFTER JOINDER .

The underlying petition arises out of allegations that respondents have unlawfully
amended the Medicare plan of current retirees.<sup>1</sup> The Court previously held on October 21, 2021,
that the selection of the Alliance to administer the proposed Medicare Advantage Plus Plan (the
“Plan”) was not arbitrary and capricious, however the implementation of the plan was irrational
and many details of the plan required refinement. Based on that determination, the Court granted

<sup>1</sup> It appears undisputed that the summary judgment motion by petitioners (seq. 4) was not legally permissible in this
proceeding. However, due to the complexity of this case, the Court reviewed the papers submitted for seq. 4 as
being incorporated to the 2 motion sequences that were proper: seq. 1, the order to show cause of which the
preliminary injunction was derived, and seq. 2, the original petition, and the cross-motion to dismiss by respondents.

a preliminary injunction to allow respondents to clarify and make adjustments consistent with the Court's order.

The parties have since made multiple submissions and appearances before the Court; as a result, the preliminary injunction is now vacated, and the underlying petition is ripe for resolution. For the reasons set forth below, the petition is granted to the extent indicated below and respondents' motion to dismiss the petition is denied.

First, the respondent and nominal respondent have taken many strides to improve the information available regarding the Plan, and thus, while the steps they have taken may not make things perfect, the Court finds that at this point the implementation of the Medicare Advantage Plan is no longer what this Court would consider irrational.

Second, much of the legal arguments made by the petitioners are unavailing. The respondent was well within its right to work with the Municipal Labor Council to change how retirees get their health insurance. As the municipal labor unions are the entities that enter into collective bargaining agreements, those unions, through the umbrella Municipal Labor Council may amend those agreements. Moreover, even if the Court were to find the labor unions may not bind retirees, this would only mean that the respondents could act alone without the Municipal Labor Council, which nevertheless would still not invalidate the agreement that was reached here.

Third, as the petitioners freely acknowledge, the New York State Constitution does not guarantee specific health insurance for retirees.

However, based on this Court's reading of New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126, so long as the respondent is giving retirees the option of staying in their current program, they may not do so by charging them the \$191 the respondent intends to charge. This section

states unequivocally that “[t]he City will pay the entire cost of health insurance coverage for city employees, city retirees and their dependents, not to exceed one hundred percent of the full cost of H.I.P.-H.M.O. on a category basis.”<sup>2</sup> Respondent and nominal respondent aver that the definition of “health insurance coverage”, as defined in Admin. Code § 12-126 (a), stating “a program” as opposed to “any program” means that the City of New York need only pay for the entire cost of one program. This Court respectfully disagrees. NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) is simply unequivocal and does not use terms like “provide” or “offer”; rather it uses the term will pay and it provides parameters of such payment. The definition in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (a)(iv) simply provides what constitutes a program or plan that the City of New York is required by law to pay for, by defining the contents of such a plan. This Court holds that this is the only reasonable way of interpreting this section.

Of course, none of this is to say that the respondent must give retirees an option of plans, nor that if the plan goes above the threshold discussed in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) that the respondent could not pass along the cost above the threshold to the retiree; only that if there is to be an option of more than one plan, that the respondent may not pass any cost of the prior plan to the retirees, as it is the Court’s understanding that the threshold is not crossed by the cost of the retirees’ current health insurance plan. This is buoyed by the fact that the current plan has been paid for by the respondent in full to this point. Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED that the preliminary injunction previously put into place by this Court is lifted, except that:

1. Enrollment in the Medicare Advantage Plan may not occur until at least April 1, 2022, and that retirees shall have the option of opting out of the Medicare

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court refers to this below as the “threshold”.

Advantage Plan for not less than three months following the effective date of the Medicare Advantage Plan;

- 2. The respondent is permanently enjoined from passing along any costs of the New York City retirees' current plan to the retiree or to any of their dependents, except where such plan rises above the H.I.P.-H.M.O. threshold, as provided by New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126; and
- 3. The respondent shall ensure that all retirees and dependents of such retirees pay the deductible for only one plan for the calendar year 2022.

  
 20220303105510LFRANKB4A875C50D941B88150FAC1F30767E3

3/3/2022  
 DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
 LYLE E. FRANK, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CASE DISPOSED	<input type="checkbox"/> DENIED	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER
APPLICATION:	<input type="checkbox"/> GRANTED	<input type="checkbox"/> SUBMIT ORDER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GRANTED IN PART	<input type="checkbox"/> REFERENCE
CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:	<input type="checkbox"/> SETTLE ORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT		
	<input type="checkbox"/> INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN			

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT: HON. LYLE E. FRANK PART 11M

Justice

-----X

NYC ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREES, INC, LISA FLANZRAICH, BENAY WAITZMAN, LINDA WOOLVERTON, ED FERINGTON, MERRI TURK LASKY, PHYLLIS LIPMAN,

Plaintiff,

INDEX NO. 158815/2021

10/21/2021, N/A,

MOTION DATE 02/22/2022

MOTION SEQ. NO. 001 002 004

- v -

RENEE CAMPION, CITY OF NY OFFICE OF LABOR RELATIONS, CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION

-----X

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 001) 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 212

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 002) 2, 57, 63, 64, 65, 79, 80, 81, 82, 96, 113, 166, 205, 206

were read on this motion to/for INJUNCTION/RESTRAINING ORDER.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 004) 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 208, 209, 210, 213

were read on this motion to/for SUMMARY JUDGMENT(AFTER JOINDER).

The underlying petition arises out of allegations that respondents have unlawfully amended the Medicare plan of current retirees.1 The Court previously held on October 21, 2021, that the selection of the Alliance to administer the proposed Medicare Advantage Plus Plan (the "Plan") was not arbitrary and capricious, however the implementation of the plan was irrational and many details of the plan required refinement. Based on that determination, the Court granted

1 It appears undisputed that the summary judgment motion by petitioners (seq. 4) was not legally permissible in this proceeding. However, due to the complexity of this case, the Court reviewed the papers submitted for seq. 4 as being incorporated to the 2 motion sequences that were proper: seq. 1, the order to show cause of which the preliminary injunction was derived, and seq. 2, the original petition, and the cross-motion to dismiss by respondents.

a preliminary injunction to allow respondents to clarify and make adjustments consistent with the Court's order.

The parties have since made multiple submissions and appearances before the Court; as a result, the preliminary injunction is now vacated, and the underlying petition is ripe for resolution. For the reasons set forth below, the petition is granted to the extent indicated below and respondents' motion to dismiss the petition is denied.

First, the respondent and nominal respondent have taken many strides to improve the information available regarding the Plan, and thus, while the steps they have taken may not make things perfect, the Court finds that at this point the implementation of the Medicare Advantage Plan is no longer what this Court would consider irrational.

Second, much of the legal arguments made by the petitioners are unavailing. The respondent was well within its right to work with the Municipal Labor Council to change how retirees get their health insurance. As the municipal labor unions are the entities that enter into collective bargaining agreements, those unions, through the umbrella Municipal Labor Council may amend those agreements. Moreover, even if the Court were to find the labor unions may not bind retirees, this would only mean that the respondents could act alone without the Municipal Labor Council, which nevertheless would still not invalidate the agreement that was reached here.

Third, as the petitioners freely acknowledge, the New York State Constitution does not guarantee specific health insurance for retirees.

However, based on this Court's reading of New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126, so long as the respondent is giving retirees the option of staying in their current program, they may not do so by charging them the \$191 the respondent intends to charge. This section



states unequivocally that “[t]he City will pay the entire cost of health insurance coverage for city employees, city retirees and their dependents, not to exceed one hundred percent of the full cost of H.I.P.-H.M.O. on a category basis.<sup>2</sup>” Respondent and nominal respondent aver that the definition of “health insurance coverage”, as defined in Admin. Code § 12-126 (a), stating “a program” as opposed to “any program” means that the City of New York need only pay for the entire cost of one program. This Court respectfully disagrees. NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) is simply unequivocal and does not use terms like “provide” or “offer”; rather it uses the term will pay and it provides parameters of such payment. The definition in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (a)(iv) simply provides what constitutes a program or plan that the City of New York is required by law to pay for, by defining the contents of such a plan. This Court holds that this is the only reasonable way of interpreting this section.

Of course, none of this is to say that the respondent must give retirees an option of plans, nor that if the plan goes above the threshold discussed in NYC Admin. Code § 12-126 (b)(1) that the respondent could not pass along the cost above the threshold to the retiree; only that if there is to be an option of more than one plan, that the respondent may not pass any cost of the prior plan to the retirees, as it is the Court’s understanding that the threshold is not crossed by the cost of the retirees’ current health insurance plan. This is buoyed by the fact that the current plan has been paid for by the respondent in full to this point. Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED that the preliminary injunction previously put into place by this Court is lifted, except that:

1. Enrollment in the Medicare Advantage Plan may not occur until at least April 1, 2022, and that retirees shall have the option of opting out of the Medicare

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court refers to this below as the “threshold”.

Advantage Plan for not less than three months following the effective date of the Medicare Advantage Plan;

2. The respondent is permanently enjoined from passing along any costs of the New York City retirees' current plan to the retiree or to any of their dependents, except where such plan rises above the H.I.P.-H.M.O. threshold, as provided by New York City Administrative Code Section 12-126; and
3. The respondent shall ensure that all retirees and dependents of such retirees pay the deductible for only one plan for the calendar year 2022.

  
 20220303105510LFRANKB4A875C50D941B88150FAC1F30767E3

3/3/2022  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
LYLE E. FRANK, J.S.C.

CHECK ONE:


CASE DISPOSED  
 GRANTED  DENIED  
 SETTLE ORDER  
 INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN


NON-FINAL DISPOSITION  
 GRANTED IN PART  
 SUBMIT ORDER  
 FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT


OTHER  
 REFERENCE

APPLICATION:

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE: