9-2007

Successor Liability in New York

George Kuney

George W. Kuney (gkuney@utk.edu) is Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Clayton Center for Entrepreneurial Law at the University of Tennessee College of Law. He is the author of *The Elements of Contract Drafting* (West 2003); *Contracts: Transactions and Litigation* (co-author Prof. Robert Lloyd, West 2006); and *California Law of Contracts* (CEB 2006), as well as law review and other articles dealing with business, contracts, Chapter 11, and insolvency issues. He earned his undergraduate degree from the University of California, Santa Cruz, his law degree from the University of California's Hastings College of the Law, and an M.B.A. from the University of San Diego.

Successor Liability in New York

By George W. Kuney

Successor liability is an exception to the general rule that, when one corporate or other juridical person sells assets to another entity, the assets are transferred free and clear of all but valid liens and security interests. When successor liability is imposed, a creditor or plaintiff with a claim against the seller may assert that claim against and collect payment from the purchaser.

Historically, successor liability was a flexible doctrine, designed to eliminate the harsh results that could attend strict application of corporate law. Over time, however, as successor liability doctrines evolved, they became, in many jurisdictions, ossified and lacking in flexibility. As this occurred, corporate lawyers and those who structure transactions learned how to avoid application of successor liability doctrines.[1]

There are two broad groups of successor liability doctrines: those that are judge-made (the "common law" exceptions) and those that are creatures of statute. Both represent a distinct public policy that, in certain instances and for certain liabilities, the general rule of nonliability of a successor for a predecessor's debts, following an asset sale, should not apply. This article addresses the status of the first group, judge-made successor liability.[2]

The current judge-made successor liability law appears to have developed because of and in reaction to the rise of corporate law in the last half of the 19th century and early part of the 20th century. It may be better characterized as a part of that body of law, much like the "alter ego" or "piercing the corporate veil" doctrines,[3] rather than as a creature of tort law, although it is used as a tool by plaintiffs who are involuntary tort claimants.

Many sources and authorities list four, five, or six basic types of situations in which judge-made successor liability has sometimes been recognized: for example, (1) express or implied assumption, (2) fraud, (3) *de facto* merger, (4) mere continuation, (5) continuity of enterprise, and (6) product line.[4] In fact, the matter is more complicated than that. Each of these species of successor liability has, within it, different subspecies with different standards and variations in the jurisdictions that recognize them. Some use a list of mandatory elements while others are based on a non-exclusive list of factors and considerations to be weighed and balanced in a "totality of the circumstances" fashion. Some approaches that relied on a flexible list of factors have evolved into one consisting of one or more mandatory elements. In any event, to state that there are only four, five, or six categories is to oversimplify the matter.[5]

The State of Successor Liability in New York

When examined in detail, the types of successor liability can be classified into five general species, each of which is specifically defined on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. These are: (1) Intentional Assumptions of

Liabilities, (2) Fraudulent Schemes to Escape Liability, (3) *De Facto* Mergers, (4) The Continuity Exceptions: Mere Continuation and Continuity of Enterprise, and (5) The Product Line Exception.

When examining successor liability, especially when moving from one jurisdiction to another, one should keep in mind that there is variance and overlap between the species and their formulation in particular jurisdictions. The label a court uses for its test is not necessarily one with a standardized meaning applicable across jurisdictions. Accordingly, it is dangerous to place too much reliance on a name; the underlying substance should always be examined.

Intentional (Express or Implied) Assumption of Liabilities

Intentional assumption is probably the simplest of the successor liability species. Imposing liability on a successor that by its actions is shown to have assumed liabilities is essentially an exercise in the realm of contract law, drawing on doctrines of construction and the objective theory of contract.[6]

New York courts recognize the express or implied assumption exception to the general rule of nonliability. In the few cases which have addressed this exception, courts have looked at the language of the purchase agreement to determine whether the successor has expressly assumed any liabilities of the predecessor.[7]

Fraudulent Schemes to Escape Liability

Fraudulent schemes to escape liability by using corporate law limitation-of-liability principles to defeat the legitimate interests of creditors illustrate the need for successor liability to prevent injustice. If a corporation's equity holders, for example, arrange for the company's assets to be sold to a new company in which they also hold an equity or other stake, for less value than would be produced if the assets were deployed by the original company in the ordinary course of business, then the legitimate interests and expectations of the company's creditors have been frustrated.[8] By allowing liability to attach to the successor corporation in such instances, the creditors' interests and expectations are respected. The challenge, of course, is defining the standard that separates the fraudulent scheme from the legitimate one.

While New York courts recognize the exception to the general rule of nonliability for asset purchasers where "the transaction is entered into fraudulently to escape [tort] obligations,"[9] no published New York decision appears to have analyzed the contours of the fraud exception.

De Facto Merger

In a *statutory* merger, the successor corporation becomes liable for the predecessor's debts.[10] The *de facto* merger

One of the traditional exceptions exists where there has been a "consolidation or merger of seller and purchaser."

species of successor liability creates the same result in the asset sale context to avoid allowing form to overcome substance. A *de facto* merger, then, allows liability to attach when an asset sale has mimicked the results of a statutory merger except for the continuity of liability. The main difference between the subspecies of *de facto* merger among the various jurisdictions appears in how rigid or flexible the test is. In other words, how many required elements must be shown to establish applicability of the doctrine? On one end of the spectrum is the lengthy, mandatory checklist of criteria. On the other end is the non-exclusive list of factors to be weighed in a totality-of-the-circumstances fashion.

One of the traditional exceptions to the general rule of nonliability exists where there has been a "consolidation or merger of seller and purchaser."[11] A transaction structured as a purchase of assets may be deemed to fall within this exception as a "*de facto* merger, even if the parties chose not to effect a formal merger."[12] In analyzing whether a *de facto* merger has occurred, the following points are considered:

> (1) continuity of ownership; (2) cessation of ordinary business operations and the dissolution of the selling corporation as soon as possible after the transaction; (3) the buyer's assumption of the liabilities ordinarily necessary for the uninterrupted continuation of the seller's business; and (4) continuity of management, personnel, physical location, assets and general business operation.[13]

Not all of these factors necessarily need be present for a finding of *de facto* merger.[14]

Continuation of the Business: The Continuity Exceptions

An exception with two distinct subcategories permits successor liability when the successor continues the business of the seller: mere continuation and continuity of enterprise. The two share roughly the same indications but continuity of enterprise does not require continuity of shareholders or directors or officers between the predecessor and the successor, a requirement said to be one of mere continuation's dispositive elements or factors.[15] Courts are not altogether careful or uniform in labeling which exception they are applying. There appear to be four general subspecies of mere continuation and three of continuity of enterprise. The similarity of these doctrines to those of *de facto* merger is striking.[16]

Mere Continuation

As New York appears to have adopted the more expansive continuity of enterprise doctrine, discussion of mere continual liability as an independent theory of recovery seems to be unnecessary, although the state of the law in this area of New York law is far from clear.

Continuity of Enterprise

As previously indicated, unlike the more traditional and long-standing mere continuation exception, the continuity of enterprise theory does not require strict continuity between the predecessor and the successor – although the degree or extent of continuity of owners, directors and officers is a factor.[17] Further, continuity of enterprise generally does not require dissolution of the predecessor upon or soon after the sale, which is often a factor – and sometimes a requirement – in jurisdictions applying the mere continuation doctrine.[18] All the variations of the continuity of enterprise exception derive from *Turner v. Bituminous Casualty Co.*[19] V ariations in the application of the *Turner* factors create the three subspecies.

In *Turner,* the Michigan Supreme Court expanded the four traditional categories of successor liability and, in so doing, developed the continuity of enterprise theory.[20] The court adopted the rule that, in the sale of corporate assets for cash, three criteria would be the threshold guidelines to establish whether there is continuity of enterprise between the transferee and the transferor corporations.

1. There is a continuation of the enterprise of the seller corporation, so that there is a continuity of management, personnel, physical location, assets, and general business operations;
2. the seller corporation ceases its ordinary business operations, liquidates, and dissolves as soon as legally and practically possible; and
3. the purchasing corporation assumes those liabilities and obligations of the seller ordinarily necessary for the uninterrupted continuation of normal business operations of the seller corporation.[21]

The Michigan Supreme Court did not address the limits of the continuity of enterprise exception again until 1999, in *Foster v. Cone-Blanchard Machine Co.*[22] In *Foster,* a plaintiff, injured while operating a feed screw machine, sued the corporate successor after receiving a $500,000 settlement from the predecessor corporation.[23] The court held that "because [the] predecessor was available for recourse as witnessed by plaintiff's negotiated settlement with the predecessor for $500,000, the continuity of enterprise theory of successor liability is inapplicable."[24]

The continuity of enterprise theory does not require strict continuity between the predecessor and the successor.

The *Foster* court thus resolved two issues left open in *Turner.* First, the Michigan appellate decisions prior to *Foster* cited *Turner* for the proposition that the continuity of enterprise test comprised four elements or factors, following the four items enumerated in the *Turner* court's holding and not the three listed in its announcement of the rule.[25] The *Foster* court clarified that, in fact, only three items are involved in the *Turner* rule, and they are required elements.[26]

Second, the *Foster* court held that the "'continuity of enterprise' doctrine applies only when the transferor is no longer viable and capable of being sued."[27] The underlying rationale of *Turner,* said the court, was "to provide a source of recovery for injured plaintiffs."[28] According to Justice Brickley, *Turner* expanded liability based on the successor's continued enjoyment of "certain continuing benefits": "[T]he test in *Turner* is designed to determine whether the company (or enterprise) involved in the lawsuit is essentially the same company that was allegedly negligent in designing or manufacturing the offending product."[29]

The *Foster* decision thus appears to return Michigan law to its state immediately after *Turner* was decided: continuity of enterprise is a recognized doctrine of successor liability and the doctrine has three required elements. To the extent that intervening decisions had narrowed *Turner* with the addition of a fourth factor – whether

the purchasing corporation holds itself out to the world as the effective continuation of the seller corporation – that particular revision appears to have been reversed. Further, to the extent that *Turner*'s "guidelines" had been considered factors by other courts adopting the continuity of enterprise, *Foster* made it clear that it interpreted the rule as one comprising three elements.

At least one New York Supreme Court has adopted the three-criteria test of *Turner*.[30] "[1] whether there was a continuation of the enterprise of the original entity; [2] whether the original entity ceased its ordinary business operations and dissolved promptly after the transaction; [3] and whether the purchasing entity assumed those liabilities and obligations of the seller normally required for an uninterrupted continuation of the seller's operation."[31] Interestingly, the court did not seem to require a destruction of the plaintiff's remedies in order to satisfy the second prong of the continuity of enterprise test.[32] The court stated, "In the first sale, of course, [the predecessor] did not dissolve promptly, but continued on, in some form, for several years. What seems to be of greatest importance, however, is that it was completely out of the coffee granulizer business."[33] This application of *Turner* (without the destruction of remedy requirement) begins to look more like a hybrid of *Turner* and *Ray v. Alad Corp.*, discussed below.

Not all New York courts have adopted continuity of enterprise. Most important, the New York Court of Appeals has not addressed this exception since it expressly decided not to adopt it in *Schumacher v. Richards Shear Co.* Additionally, in 1984, the Supreme Court of Monroe County noted that *Schumacher* refused to adopt the continuity of enterprise exception.[34]

The Product Line Exception of *Ray v. Alad Corp.*[35]

In *Ray*, the California Supreme Court recognized the product line exception to the general rule of successor nonliability. This is a species of liability that is very similar to continuity of enterprise, and the court articulated the following "justifications" for imposing liability on a successor corporation:

> (1) the virtual destruction of the plaintiff's remedies against the original manufacturer caused by the successor's acquisition of the business, (2) the successor's ability to assume the original manufacturer's risk spreading role, and (3) the fairness of requiring the successor to assume a responsibility for defective products that was a burden necessarily attached to the original manufacturer's goodwill being enjoyed by the successor in the continued operation of the business.[36]

The term "justifications" is somewhat ambiguous as to whether it connotes required elements or non-exclusive factors to be balanced, much like the *Turner* guidelines.

Like the Michigan Supreme Court in *Foster*, which revisited *Turner* well after the original opinion was issued, the California Supreme Court returned to *Ray* some years later to "clarify" things. In *Henkel Corp. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co.*,[37] the California Supreme Court referred to these three justifications as "conditions," thus suggesting that they were essential elements under the product line exception. Despite its name, the product line theory of successor liability appears only rarely, if at all, to have been applied in a reported decision to a successor that had acquired merely one of many product lines from the predecessor; in nearly all reported cases, it appears to have been applied to sales of substantially all of a predecessor's assets.[38] In fact, one court has emphasized that the "policy justifications for our adopting the product line rule require the transfer of substantially all of the predecessor's assets to the successor corporation."[39]

The product line doctrine, where accepted, breaks into two distinct subspecies, which differ only as to whether *Ray*'s "virtual destruction of the plaintiff's [other] remedies" condition is strictly required in order to permit recovery.

The N.Y. Court of Appeals analyzed both the product line and continuity of enterprise exceptions in *Schumacher*, ultimately stating, "[w]e do not adopt the rule of either case [*Turner* or *Ray*], but note that both are factually distinguishable in any event."[40] This language has "resulted in a debate and some disagreement as to whether or not the Court of Appeals has rejected the two additional exceptions, or simply found the two exceptions inapplicable to the facts in that case."[41] The Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Department has adopted the product line exception,[42] while the First Department has not.[43] No N.Y. Court of Appeals decision has resolved this split in the lower courts.

Conclusion

The purpose of the successor liability doctrines was to provide contract and tort creditors with an avenue of recovery against a successor entity in appropriate cases when the predecessor that contracted with them or committed the tort or the action that later gave rise to the tort had sold substantially all of its assets and was no longer a viable source of recovery. Its various species acted as a pressure relief valve on the strict limitation of liability created by corporate law. The doctrine is in the nature of an "equitable" doctrine insofar as it is invoked when strict application of corporate law would offend the conscience of the court. In large part, the doctrine remains intact and still serves that purpose. ■

1. *See* George W. Kuney, *A Taxonomy and Evaluation of Successor Liability*, 3 Fla. St. U. Bus. Rev. 1 (2006). Note: list other of author's articles, if desired, rather than mentioning them in the text at the conclusion.

2. A detailed jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction analysis and explanation of the state of judge-made successor liability law may be found at <www.law.utk.edu/Faculty/APPENDIXKuney.htm>. The author intends to update this analysis at least twice a year so that it remains current.

3. *See generally* Steven L. Schwarcz, *Collapsing Corporate Structures: Resolving the Tension Between Form and Substance*, 60 Bus. Law. 109 (2004).

4. *See Savage Arms, Inc. v. W. Auto Supply Co.*, 18 P.3d 49 (Alaska 2001) (discussing varied approaches to determination of whether successor liability was a creature of contract and corporate law or tort law as part of its choice of law analysis and concluding that successor liability is a tort doctrine designed to expand products liability law; collecting cases and other authorities on both sides of the issue).

5. The variance in states' approaches to successor liability and to the related doctrines of alter ego or piercing the corporate veil are one of the reasons that the federal courts have adopted a uniform federal common law of these subjects under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). *See United States v. Gen. Battery Corp.*, 423 F.3d 294, 298–301 (3d Cir. 2005) (collecting authorities).

6. Michael J. Zaino, *Bielagus v. EMRE: New Hampshire Rejects Traditional Test for Corporate Successor Liability Following an Asset Purchase*, 45 N.H. B.J 26 (2004).

7. *See, e.g., Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Canron, Inc.*, 43 N.Y.2d 823, 402 N.Y.S.2d 565 (1977) (finding no express or implied assumption by a successor in a purchase agreement); *Valenta Enters., Inc. v. Columbia Gas of N.Y., Inc.*, 116 Misc. 2d 536, 539, 455 N.Y.S.2d 996 (Sup. Ct., Broome Co. 1982) (finding neither express assumption of liability nor anything "presented to the court which would warrant a finding of implied commitment to assume such responsibilities."); *Emrich v. Kroner*, 79 A.D.2d 854, 854, 434 N.Y.S.2d 491 (4th Dep't 1980) (finding that, "from the terms of the purchase agreement . . . [the successor] agreed to assume the tort liability of [the predecessor] arising out of incidents occurring after the closing date").

8. Causation is a required element of all species of the fraud exception. *See, e.g., Milliken & Co. v. Duro Textiles, LLC*, 2005 WL 1791562 (Mass. Super. Ct. June 14, 2005) (discussing need for causation, but also that judgment creditors could look to company's long term prospects, not just immediate insolvency).

9. *See Schumacher v. Richards Shear Co.*, 59 N.Y.2d 239, 245, 464 N.Y.S.2d 437 (1983).

10. G. William Joyner, III, *Beyond Budd Tire: Examining Successor Liability in North Carolina*, 30 Wake Forest L. Rev. 889, 894 (1995).

11. *See Schumacher*, 59 N.Y.2d 239.

12. *In re N.Y. City Asbestos Litig.*, 15 A.D.3d 254, 256, 789 N.Y.S.2d 484 (1st Dep't 2005).

13. *Id.*; *see Sweatland v. Park Corp.*, 181 A.D.2d 243, 245, 587 N.Y.S.2d 54 (4th Dep't 1992).

14. *In re N.Y. City Asbestos Litig.*, 15 A.D.3d at 256 (citing *Fitzgerald v. Fahnestock & Co.*, 286 A.D.2d 573, 730 N.Y.S.2d 70 (1st Dep't 2001)).

15. Rest. 3d Torts § 12, cmt. g.; Am. L. Prod. Liab. 3d § 7:20 (2004). *See, e.g., Holloway v. John C. Smith's Sons Co.*, 432 F. Supp. 454, 456 (D.S.C. 1977) (denying summary judgment to the defendant successor in a products liability suit because (1) the business continued at its same address with virtually all of the previous employees; (2) the successor was responsible for maintenance and repairs on the products sold by the predecessor prior to its sale of assets; (3) the successor continued manufacturing the same or similar products as the predecessor; and (4) the successor held itself out to the public as a business entity under a virtually identical name as its predecessor; not requiring continuity of ownership and control but calling the doctrine applied "mere continuation" anyway.); *see also Mozingo v. Correct Mfg.*, 752 F.2d 168, 175 (5th Cir. 1985) (applying Mississippi law and citing *Holloway & Cyr v. B. Offen & Co.*, 501 F.2d 1145 (1st Cir. 1974) (upon which Holloway relied) as cases following the continuity of enterprise theory); Am. L. Prod. Liab. 3d § 7:22 (noting that the court in Holloway denied summary judgment to a successor despite a lack of continuity of ownership even though the court treated its ruling as an application of the mere continuation theory); 2 Madden & Owen on Prod. Liab. § 19:6, n. 25 (3d. ed. 2003) (noting an increasing number of courts have adopted the

continuity of enterprise exception including the *Holloway* court and the Ohio Supreme Court in *Flaugher v. Cone Automatic Mach. Co.*, 30 Ohio St. 3d 60 (1987)) (this treatise is authored by David Owen, the Carolina Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of South Carolina); Richard L. Cupp, Jr., *Redesigning Successor Liability*, 1999 U. Ill. L. Rev. 845, 854 n.44 (1999) (noting that states following the continuity of enterprise approach include South Carolina (citing *Holloway*); Ohio (citing *Flaugher*), Alabama, Michigan, Mississippi, and New Hampshire (citing *Cyr*); Philip I. Blumberg, *The Continuity of the Enterprise Doctrine: Corporate Successorship in United States Law*, 10 Fla. J. Int'l L. 365, 375 (1996) (collecting cases applying the continuity of enterprise theory, including *Holloway* and *Flaugher*); 30 S.C. Jur. Products Liability § 12 (stating the court in *Holloway* denied the successor's motion for summary judgment "where the evidence indicated that the [successor] was a mere continuation of the predecessor corporation"); Rest. 3d Torts § 12, cmt. c (citing only Alabama, Michigan, and New Hampshire as jurisdictions that have adopted the continuity of enterprise theory).

16. *Gladstone v. Stuart Cinemas, Inc.*, 878 A.2d 214, 221 (Vt. 2005). Cases from the beginning of the last century in Idaho preserve another term that seems to capture all or part of the *de facto* merger, mere continuation, and continuity of enterprise exceptions: "reorganization."

17. *Mozingo*, 752 F.2d at 174 (noting that the traditional mere continuation exception requires identity of stockholders, directors and officers); *see also Savage Arms Inc. v. W. Auto Supply*, 18 P.3d 49, 55 (Alaska 2001) (mere continuation theory requires "the existence of identical shareholders").

18. *See, e.g., Turner v. Bituminous Cas. Co.*, 244 N.W.2d 873, 882 (Mich. 1976) (dissolution of the seller soon after the sale one of four enumerated factors indicating continuity of enterprise).

19. *Id.*

20. *Id.*

21. *Id.* at 879 (citing *McKee v. Harris-Seybold Co., Div. of Harris-Intertype Corp.*, 264 A.2d 98, 103, 105 (1970)). These are three of the four factors from *McKee* used to determine whether liability will arise under the *de facto* merger form of successor liability.

22. 597 N.W.2d 506 (Mich. 1999). In the interim, the court cited *Turner* in three decisions, none of which clarified the key *Turner* holding. *Jeffery v. Rapid Am. Corp.*, 529 N.W.2d 644, 656 (Mich. 1995) (citing *Turner* for the proposition that corporate law principles should not be rigidly applied in products liability cases); *Stevens v. McLouth Steel Prods. Corp.*, 446 N.W.2d 95, 99 (Mich. 1989) (citing *Turner* as a case where the Michigan Supreme Court discussed the doctrine of successor liability in the context of a products liability suit); *Langley v. Harris Corp.*, 321 N.W.2d 662, 664 (Mich. 1982) (citing *Turner* for the proposition that an acquiring corporation maybe held liable for products liability claims arising from activities of its predecessor corporation under a continuity of enterprise theory but then holding that the *Turner* rationale will not allow a corporation to seek indemnity from the plaintiff's employer in a products liability suit). One appellate court decision between *Turner* and *Foster* concluded that satisfying the fourth consideration in *Turner* (the purchasing corporation's holding itself out as a continuation of the selling corporation) was not sufficient for a finding of successor liability where the first three considerations were not met. *Pelc v. Bendix Mach. Tool Corp.*, 314 N.W.2d 614, 620 (Mich. Ct. App. 982) (Where a successor bought only 8% of the assets of another corporation in a bankruptcy sale and did not meet the first three criteria of *Turner* but held itself out as a continuation of the liquidating corporation, the mere continuation test was not satisfied. The court noted that to impose successor liability in such circumstances would effectively be an adoption of the broader "product line exception").

23. *Foster*, 597 N.W.2d at 508.

24. *Id.*

25. *Fenton Area Pub. Sch. v. Sorensen-Gross Constr. Co.*, 335 N.W.2d 221, 225 (Mich. Ct. App. 1983); *Lemire v. Garrard Drugs*, 291 N.W.2d 103, 105 (Mich. Ct. App. 1980); *Powers v. Baker-Perkins, Inc.*, 285 N.W.2d 402, 406 (Mich. Ct. App. 1979); *Pelc*, 314 N.W.2d at 618; *State Farm Fire & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Pitney-Bowes*, 1999 WL 33451719, at *1 (Mich. Ct. App. Apr. 2, 1999).

26. *Foster*, 597 N.W.2d at 510.

27. *Id.* at 511.

28. *Id.* Justice Brickley, in dissent, disagreed with the majority as to the underlying rationale of *Turner*.

29. *Id.* at 513.

30. *Salvati v. Blaw-Knox Food & Chem. Equip., Inc.*, 130 Misc. 2d 626, 633, 497 N.Y.S.2d 242 (Sup. Ct., Queens Co. 1985).

31. *Id.* at 628 (citing *Turner v. Bituminous Cas. Co.*, 244 N.W.2d 873, 879 (Mich. 1976)).

32. *Id.* at 626.

33. *Id.* at 633.

34. *Radziul v. Hooper, Inc.*, 125 Misc. 2d 362, 365, 479 N.Y.S.2d 324 (N.Y. Gen. Term 1984).

35. 560 P.2d 3 (Cal. 1977).

36. *Id.* at 9.

37. 62 P.3d 69, 73 (Cal. 2003).

38. George W. Kuney & Donna C. Looper, *Successor Liability in California*, 20 CEB Cal. Bus. L. Pract. 50 (2005).

39. *Hall v. Armstrong Cork, Inc.*, 692 P.2d 787 (Wash. 1984) (refusing to apply product line test to successor that purchased but one of many asbestos product lines).

40. *Schumacher v. Richards Shear Co.*, 59 N.Y.2d 239, 245, 464 N.Y.S.2d 437 (1983).

41. *In re Seventh Judicial Dist. Asbestos Litig.*, 6 Misc. 3d 749, 752, 788 N.Y.S.2d 484, 486 (Sup. Ct., Ontario Co. 2005).

42. *See Hart v. Bruno Mach. Co.*, 250 A.D.2d 58, 679 N.Y.S.2d 740 (3d Dep't 1998).

43. *City of N.Y. v. Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc.*, 260 A.D.2d 174, 176, 688 N.Y.S.2d 579 (1st Dep't 1999) ("We decline to follow the Third Department in adopting the 'product line' theory of successor's liability as adopted in certain other jurisdictions. . . . We understand the Court of Appeals to have rejected this theory in *Schumacher v. Richards Shear Co.*").

"He has a brilliant legal mind but he rarely brings it to court."