CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

----X

November 18, 2009 Start: 10:23 am Recess: 11:39 am

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

LEROY G. COMRIE, JR.

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Council Member Charles Barron Council Member James F. Gennaro Council Member G. Oliver Koppell

Council Member John C. Liu

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Andrew Eiler Director of Legislative Affairs Department of Consumer Affairs

Edward Gershowitz Attorney-at-Law Law Office of Gershowitz, Libo and Korek

2	[background noise, off mic comment]
3	SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Quiet, please,
4	make sure your cell phones are silent. Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Good morning,
6	my name is Leroy Comrie, I'm the Chair of the
7	Committee on Consumer Affairs. Today we'll be
8	holding our first hearing on Intro 913, a local
9	law to amend the Administrative Code of the City
10	of New York, in relation to licensing doorbuster
11	sales. I'd like to begin by thanking my colleague
12	and fellow Committee member, Council Member
13	Gennaro, who is still on his way, stuck in
14	traffic, for introducing this important piece of
15	legislation. For many Americans, the day after
16	Thanksgiving marks the official start of the
17	holiday season. Also known as Black Friday, it is
18	one of the busiest shopping days of the year.
19	Many stores capitalize on the enthusiasm generated
20	by the beginning of the holiday season, by opening
21	stores very early on Black Friday, and by offering
22	steep discounts on select merchandise.
23	Oftentimes, these types of sales, known as
24	doorbuster sales, generated large crowds and long
25	lines outside stores. Last year, Black Friday

took a tragic turn when Jimmy Damour, a temporary
worker at a Wal-Mart in Nassau County, was knocked
down and trampled to death, after 2,000 overeager
shoppers entered the store in a frenzy. Wal-Mart
was later faulted by the Nassau County Police
Department, the Nassau County District Attorney's
Office, the Occupational Health and Safety
Administration, and various other organizations
for inadequate preparation and poor crowd
management. Sadly, Mr. Damour's death was no the
first such episode to occur on Black Friday. In
2005, a 72 year old woman was trampled at
Brandsmart in Sunrise, Florida; and in 2006 a
woman in Torrance, California was injured in a
stampede when 500 gift certificates in balloons
from the ceiling of a Del Amo Fashion Center.
Retail violence is nota phenomenon limited to
Black Friday. Even a release of a hotly
anticipated product with poor planning can also
result in frenzied behavior, as in 2006 when the
release of a Sony Playstation 3 provoked a beating
in Indiana, a shooting in Massachusetts, and
vehicular violence in Wisconsin. The New York
State Assembly introduced a bill this past

February that would require all stores planning
doorbuster type sales to obtain a license at least
15 days prior to the date of the sale. As part of
the license application, a store would required to
create an submit a security plan and procedures
for crowd control. Intro 913 seeks to address
this issue at a local level. Prior to holding a
doorbusters sale, businesses would need to obtain
a license from the Department of Consumer Affairs.
Applications for a license would be submitted at
least 60 days prior to the sale date, and would
need to include pertinent information such as a
valid and accurate floor plan of the store, and a
detailed plan for crowd control, including store
capacity, numbers of shoppers expected, number of
personnel assigned to the entrances, number of
personnel assigned to work during the sale, and
the time the shoppers are permitted to begin
standing in line prior to the store's opening. At
this point, I'd like to introduce the Council
Members that are here: Council Member Oliver
Koppell from The Bronx; Council Member and
Comptroller Elect John Liu from Queens. At this
time, we are going to hear from DCA, who is here

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	this	morning.	Are your	bringing	testimony,	Mr.
---	------	----------	----------	----------	------------	-----

3 Eiler? I look forward to hearing your testimony

4 | this morning?

ANDREW EILER: Oh, it's on. Okay. Wait a minute. Good morning, Chairman Comrie, and Members of the Consumer Affairs Committee. Andrew Eiler and I'm the Director of Legislative Affairs for the Department of Consumer Affairs. Commissioner Mintz asked me to thank you for this opportunity to comment on Intro 913. appreciate the purpose of this bill, which is to promote the safety of large crowds that often gather to take advantage of deep discounts made available in sales like those on Black Friday, the day after Thanksgiving. According to the National Retail Federation, the numbers of shoppers swelled to over 127 million on Black Friday in 2008. recent years, Black Friday deals have inspired consumers to start lining up as early as midnight, sometimes even pitching tents to be there, in time to get in on the action. The rush to beat other shoppers to those few irresistible deals has also brought in its wake rudeness, jumping lines, fights, injuries and even occasional deaths as

shoppers become frenzied in their efforts to reach
the sale merchandise. To protect shoppers drawn
to such sales, Intro 913 would require that they
be licensed by the Department, that a retailer
apply for such license at least 60 days before a
qualifying sales event, and that that the
Department issue licenses for such sales only on
the approval of a detailed crowd control plan
submitted by the applicant. The bill also
provides for both civil and criminal penalties for
violations. While we share the Council's concern
about protecting the safety of shoppers, we are
concerned that the proposal does not address those
concerns, or worse actually decreases consumer
protection for the following reasons. First, this
proposal contains significant impracticalities,
including vague triggering language such as
"limited quantities," and it does not accommodate
the reality that many stores, particularly small
businesses, do not plan such sales as far in
advance as 60 days. Second, protections offered
by the submitted crowd control plan proposed here,
would be illusory. Even assuming for the moment
the Department had the expertise and additional

staff to effectively evaluate whether any proposed
plan would be adequate to ensure the safety of
shoppers, the required information a store must
provide about the number of shoppers anticipated
and the resources assigned to the plan may be
inaccurate, rendering a plan inoperative, and thus
provide only illusory and misleading protection to
the public. And third, we would caution the
Council that there may be unintended legal
disadvantages to consumers should they in fact be
injured in such sale. Store owners who fully
comply with an approved plan may argue in court
that an injured plaintiff could not recover or
should not recover as a result. Their theory
would be that in the presence of a license, that
the presence of a license absolves the store owner
from legal responsibility for any injuries in the
civil actions against retailers who followed an
approved plan that proved to be inadequate for the
actual sale. While the safety of shopper is of
paramount concern, we do not see that the bill
before you as a solution. And in fact worry that
it might impede the current system of civil and
criminal regulation designed to press merchants to

that.

safeguard shoppers on their premises under existing law. The Commissioner again thanks you for the opportunity to comment on Intro 913; I would be pleased to answer your questions.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Thank you,
Andy. What role does DCA have in overseeing
retail sales currently?

and avoiding misleading and deceptive practices in the promotion of goods and services.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: So, do you have an opportunity to hear from stores at the present time, about their sales practices, or if they're doing any event type sales, or grand opening sales, or going out of business sales?

ANDREW EILER: Oh, going out of business sales?

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: How about grand opening sales?

ANDREW EILER: No, nothing like

that. In other words, the only time the, for the going out of business sales, it's mainly to ensure the protection of the public against a false impression that may be created in such situations, that, you know, the going out of business sale is occurring when in fact it's not, leading people to imagine or believe that there are deep discounts, when in fact that's not true. But that's the whole point about the going out of business sale, that you can't--and the other thing is that the, such licenses are limited in the number of times you can apply for a renewal, so that the sale doesn't go on forever.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: And do you have any regulation about grand opening events?

Like I have a flyer here from AJ Wright, which is just opening in Flatbush tomorrow, the 19th is

Thursday, right? They're offering 100 gift cards for the first 100 people when their doors open at 8:00 o'clock. And that can also create a frenzy and a lot of people rushing each other to try to get to, try to get to the event early. Do you have any--

ANDREW EILER: Stores are not

2.

required to, under anything that we administer
right now, to tell us in advance whatever sales
promotions they have or proposals or so forth and
so on. What we would be concerned about in a
situation like that is whether or not the
information is accurate. If they're going to say
they're going to have 100 free whatever, that they
have 100.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Right, 'cause-

| -

ANDREW EILER: That's the issue.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: If you remember last year, there was a, was it MTV, or somebody was promoting giveaways in midtown for—and they promised Jet players to be there, and there was a major melee in midtown, as well, because number one that they didn't have what was promised—there was only one Jet player that showed up, and former Jet player that showed up—and there was a major problem and some violence occurred in midtown as well, because they did not have the tickets that they promised to the game, and they did not have any of the things that they had originally put out in their ad. Don't you

2.

think that the City should have some
responsibility in making sure that the consumer
does not get ripped off when someone promises a,
an event, or theygrand opening event or a
special product or a doorbusters type, doorbuster
type sales day, or event day?

mean, that's, that would be the issue with respect, that's what the Consumer Protection Law covers: deceptive practices in the sale of goods and services. And failure to, I mean, promise, making promises that are not fulfilled is the basic issue with that law. And of course, those kind of things, the Department is constantly looking at.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: So, have you received complaints about inadequate crowd management at retail stores, or different venues, when it happens?

ANDREW EILER: I'm not, no, we have not received any consumer complaints on, in that kind of situation, for those kind of issues.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Well, do you believe that the Police Department, which actually

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we should've had here also, I kind of believe that this should've been a joint hearing with the PD, to talk about the public safety aspect of it. I don't, you know, I think that we'll probably have to do that again, after we do some redrafting of the bill, because I do agree with you with some aspects of the inadequacies of the bill. But I think that there has, just be complaints at the police level about crowd management and the issues of these grand openings, or special events that try to attract people to a venue and then they wind up crushing the venue, on their way in. So, you know, I think the government should have a role in overseeing doorbuster sales. I believe that we should do whatever we can to ensure that incidents that happen, like that, like what happened at Wal-Mart last year, does not happen in the City. And I hope that we can, you know, sit down and work together to try to make that a reality. Now, you talked about the -- the three concerns about the bill, the language such as limited quantities. Right now, does DCA deal with checking whatever a retailer says in a particular ad? Do you check store ads or sales ads to make

sure that what's being promoted in the ad is actually realized? I know you do it in the vehicle industry, but--

ANDREW EILER: We do it vehicle, we focus on certain kinds of adverti--we do have someone who's reviewing advertising in the major newspapers and things. And when stuff pops out, I mean, that's what we look at, and some claims are being made that look, you know, on its face. And then of course, we get complaints about bait-and-switch and these kind of things that promises not kept and so forth. So, that, yes, we follow up on those things. And we do have a proactive program for reviewing advertising, and, you know, address them when it appears that there's some issue.

Work with--do you have someone that's monitoring the, I guess the, like this type of flyer or the different stores when they're putting in their, when they're opening up their business, to make sure that they are doing it in a manner that won't generate a doorbuster type crowd, or are you doing anything like that?

ANDREW EILER: I don't think, I

mean, again, our issues have been in the area of
the accuracy of the advertising, when those kind
of issues come up, rather than the crowd control
that they should be dealing with, 'cause that's
kind of beyond what our role is in terms of
saying, "Well, you should do this, you should do
that." With regard to you have to impose, you
have to set up this kind of crowd control, that
kind of crowd control, I mean, we have no basis
for ordering such things.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Mmhm. Okay.

And--but you would agree that there should be some type of joint role between DCA and the PD, regarding situations that you feel may be hazardous to consumer safety.

ANDREW EILER: Well--

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Has the opportunity ever come before DCA as a question mark or an event that you may need to make sure that the PD is represented for a crowd control safety type in this--

ANDREW EILER: I'm not aware that that thing has ever come before the Department in that kind of form. I mean, I--In the course of

2.

looking into this, of course the Police
Departments have been involved when crowd control
has become an issue, or when too many people were
showing up in other locations, in other venues,
you ended up with Police Department having to do
crowd control, even arresting people, for, you
know, assault and various kinds of issues like
that. So the Police Department, if crowd issues
become, arise out of the, as a result of it, they
do become involved. I mean, that's something that
happens, though after the event rather than I
think before.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Mmhm, okay.

And I agree with your third point that we should be careful about over-legitimizing a crowd control plan, because you don't want the company to say that they have, they can absolve themselves for responsibility. I think that they should do an information type of notification type to the City, about what their plan is, not looking for a City sign off on it. So, I would agree with that. I think we need to work on changing that in the bill, as well. We have been joined by Council Member Gennaro now, and Council Member Koppell. I

jurisdiction right now, does the Commissioner have any jurisdiction to regulate the way sales are handled at stores? ANDREW EILER: Not--aside from the

Consumer Protection Law, no.

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And the Consumer Protection Law doesn't give you any

Alliance is aware of these kind of issues, and

that they would be recommending to their memberswhat they should be doing to avoid liability that

4 they would have under the liability laws. I mean-

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Right,
now, would, do you think there'd be any purpose in
codifying some of those recommendations and making
them requirements for stores in New York City?

ANDREW EILER: That becomes a more problematic questions 'cause as you know, liability law basically imposes an obligation upon everybody, you know, whoever they do, and that they're required to exercise a certain degree of care. And the failure to exercise the appropriate care, then triggers a responsibility. And that is of course fiscal or financial, or to pay for the harm that results. And that applies to everybody. And I think that puts in place a kind of structure that forces people to be careful. And that's what applies in these kind of situations. And as a matter of fact, there's one retailer who's been paid out over \$2 million for injury claims. OSHA was involved in the case with regard to, in Long Island, they ended up with the maximum fine of

\$7,000, for failing to have the appropriate, you know, safety measures or crowd control measures in place. So there, there is currently, under the current liability structure, and OSHA and so forth, there are requirements that they're supposed to follow that are meant to protect. Now there's nothing that we can do, no law that we can pass, that will prevent it. The only thing that we can do is put in place a structure to hold people accountable if they don't take the appropriate care. And that's what the liability system does.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Right, but let me say, and I value your opinion on whether this should be under the Department of Consumer Affairs, maybe it should be under the Building Department, or maybe under the Police Department. So, I mean, the--if I look at the recommendations of the National Retail Federation, there are certain specific recommendations made that, so for instance, talking about some of the physical things, they say, you know, signage, placed in strategic locations identifying where the event or merchandise is located, stanchions and barriers,

25

2	outside or inside, to manage traffic flow.
3	Tickets or wristbands can be used to maintain
4	orderly lines; a designated chain of command, a
5	site map, creating a site map noting entrances,
6	exits, traffic flow. I mean, and there are other
7	things here, I won't read the whole thing. If
8	that is the idea of the bill, which requires that
9	a plan be presented to you, to your Department,
10	outlining what the store is going to do. Now, is
11	it a good idea to have such a plan?
12	ANDREW EILER: Well, clearly it is
13	a good idea for the store, to avoid liability, for
14	failing to have it and creating a disaster. It is
15	the incentive of the store to have such a plan.
16	And
17	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: You don't
18	think such a plan should be mandated by law, in
19	whole or in part?
20	ANDREW EILER: Well, it mandated by
21	liability law. Liability law
22	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I know,
23	but liability law is very vague in this regard, I

would suspect. I mean, unless you can point to

something specific, the liability law would say

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the store has, can't be negligent.

ANDREW EILER: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And then that's subject to interpretation through court decisions and such. But we tend to codify some aspects of liability law, many aspects of liability law, I mean, you know, it's--liability law would say that if you drive 100 miles an hour down a residential street, and you cause an accident, you're liable. But we put a speed limit of what, 30 miles an hour or 20 miles an hour, notwithstanding the fact that there's liability law. So, that's just sort of a crude example, but there are many examples where we've codified certain requirements, even though there may be legal liability. But we still codify requirements either in law or in regulation. We have countless regulations of human activity of various sorts, codified, even though in many instances the violation of such standards would be actionable under common law. So the question here is should we have substantive law in addition to the somewhat vague requirements of liability law, should we have substantive law, to put into place

2 requirements of stores to avoid the problems that
3 have arisen with respect to these sales.

ANDREW EILER: Well, the question that raises is how complete that kind of standardization of codification can be, and then what happens at the edges. And basically, what you, what you have if you codify something, does that then create protection for, if you follow the codified requirements, is that then absolve you of any responsibility for anything else?

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Or maybe it should. I mean, maybe--

ANDREW EILER: Well--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: --from the point of view of the business, maybe, maybe they should know, they maybe should have a safe harbor. I mean, people also are responsible in themselves for conducting themselves appropriately. I mean, if the store does everything possible, and 100 people, notwithstanding the proper safeguards and everything else, you know, push, I don't know that the store should be liable in that instance. I mean, that's the individual's responsibility. So, I'm not, it's not our job to create a trap,

either. So, if we create a, if we create a safe
harbor, if you will, I mean, if we, presumably,
under normal circumstances to use my crude
example, if there's a 30 mile an hour speed limit,
and someone's driving 27 miles an hour, and they
have an accident, absent other factors, they
couldn't be held responsible for speeding. Of
course, if there's special circumstances, there's
a big rainstorm or something, they might still be.
But we've created a standard, and in violating,
not violating that standard probably does provide
at least somewhat of a safe harbor. So, I don't
think that that's a good argument that you make.
Let me ask you this, assuforget for a moment
whether you agree or disagree, if I believe, as a
legislator, that there ought to be certain
regulations of these sales, and that the stores
ought to be required to do certain things to
protect the consumer, should you be the ones to
regulate this? Because you have indicated that
the Department of Consumer Affairs basically
regulates deceptive practices, they don't regulate
the conduct of the enterprise in this sense.
Should it be you that we put this responsibility,

2	should it be the Police Department, should it be
3	the Building Department? Who shouldshould, if
4	wemy own view if licensing is probably an
5	unnecessary step, but I think that creating
6	requirements is a good idea. If we create
7	requirements, and perhaps give some agency
8	additional rulemaking power, 'cause I don't know
9	if we can think of everything that ought to be
10	done, I think we should create reasonwe should
11	legislate standards and then we should let perhaps
12	an administrator put into place rules. That's
13	generally the way we do things. We create overall
14	standards and then we have rulemaking power.
15	Should this be given to your Commissioner in your
16	view? Or should it be given to the Police
17	Department, or maybe the Building Department?
18	What's your opinion on that?
19	ANDREW EILER: Well, basically on
20	this
21	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: If we do
22	it, if we do it
23	ANDREW EILER:basic
24	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:contrary
25	to your advice.

2	ANDREW EILER: Well, it would
3	basically depend on, I'm not the one at this
4	point, without knowing what the proposal would be,
5	who would be best able to effectuate the proposal.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, I'm
7	telling you what the proposal would be.
8	ANDREW EILER: Well, even whatever
9	the standards, you mean you have standards and
10	what the standards would call for, and how it
11	would be implemented and effectuated. Like what
12	you have here is, yes you have situations that
13	rarely, it doesn't very, happen very often, that
14	someone engages, you end up with these doorbuster
15	sales. That's where the licensing scheme comes
16	into play where you put in play a review process
17	that would require an enormous expenditure of
18	resources to review all these things, when
19	essentially it would not be necor it wouldn't
20	be, wouldn't have much of an impact one way or the
21	other, because people follow their response, and
22	do what needs to be done.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, I'm
24	not suggesting licensing.

ANDREW EILER: Okay.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:	T'm
_	COONCIL MANDER ROLLED	

suggesting that we set up a series of standards that stores will have to comply with--

ANDREW EILER: Well--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Such as, so that if, for instance, we could set up one standard that they'd have the responsibility of notifying the police. That could be a standard. If they're going to hold one of these sales, they have to notify the police. Another standard could be that if it's reasonably anticipated that more than X number of people will show up, that they have some sort of stanchions or gates so as to-for crowd control. There are a whole series of things, the National Retail Federation rules probably provide a good starting place. If we set up those rules, should--I'm not saying to review them in advance, I'm saying should the rules be under your Department or should we give it to somebody else?

ANDREW EILER: Probably, with respect to if you're talking about crowd control, safety, and that kind of thing, it's definitely not within a normal activity of the Department of

25

2	Consumer Affairs. Where it would be appropriately
3	lodged would depend upon exactly what would be the
4	proposal and what, what requirements are, and that
5	would identify which agency would best be able to
6	deal with the issue that you wanted to address.
7	But since it's
8	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: They're
9	mostly crowd control issues, I would think.
10	That's my impression, I may be wrong, but which
11	agency would you recommend?
12	ANDREW EILER: I think you, I'm not
13	going to recommend which agency, I'm not going to
14	be the one to pick who should be doing what when
15	I'm not sure what it is they're going to be doing.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, I, I
17	sort of thought I told you, but I guess you're
18	going to take the Fifth on that. So, I'll leave
19	it at that. Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Councilman
21	Gennaro.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you,
23	Mr. Chairman. I have to say, Mr. Eiler, I've been

associated with this Council for almost 20 years,

as a staff member, and as a Council Member. And

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this is perhaps, I think, one of the sorriest displays I've ever seen from any agency regarding what I think is a very constructive proposal. we could stay here, we could stay here for four days, and you would just come up with more and more reasons why it doesn't make any sense to do anything, or why the City really shouldn't bother, or the City would expose itself to liability. Obviously, it's Department of--your agency, and perhaps this Administration, that there is just not a problem here, and I fail to see why your agency perhaps, in you know, consultation with other agencies, couldn't come here with a presentation that amounted to anything more than "Don't bother us with this," which is really what you're testimony and all your presentation has been, since the time that I've been in the room. I didn't hear what you said earlier. Let's just go over briefly what happens in other kinds of street assemblages. It is, there's no way you can get a couple of people in the city together, you know, without requiring some sort of permit, some sort of structure, some sort of oversight, some sort of action on the part of the government to

make sure that public safety is going to be
provided for. If somebody wants to do a block
party or a street fair, or a parade, or some kind
of activity, you know, within one of our public
parks, I mean, all of that has to beall of that
requires the submission of plans to somebody. You
know, you need a street activity permit, or you
need this, or you need that, or you need a permit
from the Parks Department. You know, you can't
hit a tennis ball in this town without somebody,
somebody from the government making sure that the
public safety and wellbeing is going to be
provided for. And I would posit that most of
those kinds of, most of those kinds of things are
not something where people are going to be
gathering in the middle of the night, they're
anxious about, you know, getting in there. People
have nothing to do other than, you know, get on
each other's nerves, like while they're waiting
for the doors to be opened. I think this kind of
situation where you have actors within the City,
whether it's a, whether it's, you know, some of
kind of retail establishment, or in other kinds of
situations where they're having some sort of

audition or something, where people have to line
up and queue up, and that there've been problems
with that kind of thing. It would seem that it's
incumbent upon the government to make sure, when
these, you know, impromptu kinds of, or actually
they're not impromptu, they're planned,
advertised, they're, you know, going to attract
thousands of people, you know, with no public
safety provided for, it is certainly incumbent
upon the government to take steps to make sure
that the entity that's doing this, has done their
appropriate due diligence, and you know, made
appropriate provisions for security. Like many
retailers already do, because they don't want to
be subject to liability. But we can't be
dependent upon everybody to do that, and there are
going to be bad actors, and there are going to
people, are going to be people who don't care.
And frankly these bad actors are not threatened by
a \$7,000 fine that I think you just mentioned a
few minutes ago. It would be, you know, merely a
cost of doing business. So, what I had hoped for
was when they, you know, Department of Consumer
Affairs, you know, came here today, there would at

least be a recognition that this is something
that, you know, government needs to focus on. And
perhaps at the, you know, Department of Consumer
Affairs is not quite the right entity to do that,
but there, you know, is a recognition of this and
you could've come here today saying, "Well, I've
had a consultation with the, you know, Department
of, you know, Transportation; I've had
consultation, you know, with the Police
Department; I've had consultation with the
Building Department" maybe "We've reached out to
our neighbors in Nassau County where this, you
know, terrible stampeded happened last year." And
even though you could say, "I don't speak for
these other departments, this is the direction
that we believe we ought to be going," and you
know, "Here is a, you know, framework that we
think we can, you know, use as a basis to
proceed." But that's not what we've heard.
You've just, you're just completely blowing of
this whole topic. And I think it's a sorry
display on the part of the Department of Consumer
Affairs, because you know, while we, you know,
want to, you know, protect consumers from, you

know, businesses that are going to cheat them, or
you know, in some way deceive them, at the end of
the day, whether it's through the, you know,
Department of Consumer Affairs or some other organ
of city government, our job first and foremost is,
you know, before we protect their pocketbook from,
you know, business practices, is to protect their
basic, you know, health, wellbeing and safety.
And you've come here before us today with a very,
you know, bureaucratic mindset that says, "This is
not what we do." And you know, we have liability
laws in place, but still we have stampedes, wewe
have people getting injured and killed. And I
don't know that it makes sense to even engage you
in a detailed line of questioning on where we can
go, because you haven't done the due diligence on
this, and frankly I don't think you or your agency
really care. If you want to respond to that, go
ahead.
ANDREW EILER: Well, sir, I was

asked to come her to comment on the content of Intro 913, and to the--and whether those proposals would address, and would in fact deal with the issue at hand. We don't, you know, we take

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 seriously, the fact that consumers get injured.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: I don't

4 | think you do.

ANDREW EILER: The question becomes, the questions becomes, whether or not this proposal, with its requirements, would enhance public safety. Now, let's take a question of liability. Liability law imposes severe financial penalties if harm occurs as a result of failure to do something. This law imposes some penalties for failing to follow those requirements, which are vastly less than what OSHA imposed on the store where somebody died. So, the question in terms of the adequacy of this proposal putting something in place, is whether or not this really does put any incentives in play that are greater than the incentives that already exist to make people do the right thing. And given the legisl--given the proposals, one of the concerns that we raised is the triggering mechanisms. Now, this calls for licensing and activity, but the triggering mechanisms are so vague and ambiguous, you would be very hard-pressed to tell whether or not the activity needs to be licensed. Now, the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

even occurs on one day. They're supposed to be giving us informa--or getting the license 60 days in advance. We wouldn't know whether a, whether a sale is going to be held. We would not find out until two, three, four days beforehand. And then, we're supposed to, then you're going to use the licensing mechanism to try to enforce this, with the vague requirements for whether or not you even need a license? By the time you got through all that, the sale would be a month over. So, I mean, what you're asking that you're--my point is, we did look at this. We raised issues about the adequacy of this proposal to address the very serious issues. And our point was that there are things that really the proposal falls short. We're not denying the importance of having safeguards to ensure that the public is adequately protected. We raise the issues about whether or not this proposal will advance those goals. don't think so. COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And that

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And that is fine for, for the agency to come in here to criticize, as you should do, and to show where there are, you know, shortcomings in the approach

that we have taken. But when I think of the vast
resources of this administration and all of its
transportation professionals, and all of its
building professionals, and all of its public
safety professionals, and all of its Department of
Consumer Affairs professionals, you know, this
administration and, you know, any mayoralty, you
know, has a significant amount of professional
expertise, you know, to bear on this problem. And
I don't see any, you know, concrete proposals sort
of coming from the Administration, as to what we
could, you know, realistically do. I see
criticisms of what we have proposed, and that's
fine and appropriate to do that, but rather than,
you know, just, you know, criticize the efforts
that we have taken in this proposal and to show
how, in our opinion, and in the Administration,
and in the opinion of your agency, and of this
Administration, how they don't get the job done,
it is more constructive for the Administration to
come here and tell us how we can provide, you
know, for the public safety, of these people who,
you know, come onto these long lines. And that,
in my opinion, hasn't been done. So, just as, you

know, you are criticizing what, you know, we have
done here, I don't think this is a good day for
the Department of Consumer Affairs, or for the
Bloomberg Administration, with regard to taking
this issue seriously and giving us concrete
proposals, like they've tried to do in other
jurisdiction, like you know, Nassau County where
this happened. And that I see as a problem. You
know, not coming here with, you know, some sort of
concrete thing that we could try to do, to get
this serious need corrected. And you know, your
statement basically is that there's, you know,
nothing we can do. And you know, we have
liability laws, and people, if they don't live up
to the liability laws, people are going to get
hurt, people are going to get killed, and you
know, recourse is that, you know, people are going
to get sued. And that is, I think, you know,
unsatisfactory, to go forward with that as our
posture. Because you tell that to the families of
the people who get, you know, injured or killed,
and that they can take, you know, scant, you know,
comfort from the fact that, you know, the people
who set this chain of events in motion, are going

to be subject to a \$7,000 fine, and, you know,
some kind of fine. I don't think it would be
terribly difficult for us as a City to figure out
a way to mandate that the entities who do these
kinds of sales, and do these kinds of events,
where people are going to be congregating without
any kind of supervision, I don't think it'd be
difficult to in some way mandate that they do what
many retailers already do. There are many
retailers that do this on a regular basis, they're
very concerned about liability, they make sure
that they have security personnel, they make sure
that they have barricades, they make sure that the
crowd is, you know, monitored, and you know,
somehow informed as to, you know, when the doors
are going to open, or whatever. And the cops are,
you know, notified as to what's going on. I don't
think it's difficult to get everybody to do what
many of the major actors on this playing field
like already do. I don't think that's difficult.
But according to you, to quote, "There's nothing
we can do," and I think that's a sorry state of
affairs.

ANDREW EILER: Thank you very much.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	COUNCIL	MEMBER	GENNARO:	Thank	you

3 Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: I'm going to have Councilman Barron go first.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. You know, I find it ironic that the Mayor's Consumer Affairs Protection seems to be more concerned about protecting retailers and business folk thank consumers. And the reason why I say that, you usually have some pretty intelligent responses to our bills; this one falls far short. Number one, you say that small businesses and businesses would have difficulties letting you know that sales are going to happen 60 days in advance. What's the problem? They tell you three days now, you're saying, but 60 days is that they won't be able to do that, that that's not reasonable, that's not thinkable? businesses have ten year visions, they have detailed plans for a year. I don't see why they couldn't get information to you about, particularly on so-called Black Friday, that comes every year, they know that's going to happen a year in advance, and there's some other times

where they know these sales are going to happen.
When I see some of this, this is when we get
suspicious, whether the Mayor's protecting his
business friends or are you really trying to
protect consumers, because that one doesn't make
sense. And then to prioritize suing over safety
doesn't make sense, even if there's anything that
could happen that can bring safety, you don't want
to have to sue, 'cause you don't want a person to
die, you don't want a person to be injured. So it
seems that a plan that could possibly prevent an
injury, prevent a death, gives less weight than
their ability to sue after death, or after an
injury. That doesn't make sense, either. And
then, you say that it would be illusory for us to
be able to determine how many people will show up,
well that's with everything. You know, I've done
a lot of demonstrations and the police ask us how
many people are going to be there. We don't know
whether it's really going to be 500 or 1,000 or
2,000, so people take their estimate and they make
a plan on the best estimate. So to say that it's
'cause you can't predict the number of people
because you won't be able to really sue, and that

you, you know, you won't know how to do sales in advance, makes absolutely zero sense. So that's why, and I agree with Council Member Gennaro, it makes, makes us think, "What's really behind this?" because that really doesn't make sense.

What's wrong with having a plan and be licensed and trying to prevent death? We all agree, we all agree that people have died and have been injured and fights have occurred. So obviously whatever's in place is not working. So something else has to happen. So to me, this is just a marginal step in the right direction, and it can be made stronger, better, whatever, but it is a step in the right direction. I just don't understand this weak response to a very, very serious issue.

ANDREW EILER: Well, I mean, whether or whatever this bill does, or any system, the only thin that, as I said before, nothing, no law requirements that are put in place will prevent things from happening. The only thing that any kind of law can effectively do, or any kind of standard or rule, is to hold people accountable for the actions that they take, that are deemed to be inappropriate, in whatever manner

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So saying

3 that we have to have a plan--

ANDREW EILER: So--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --saying that it has to take in consideration all of the things that's in our proposal. Saying that you will be, have to be accountable, you have to really think this thing through, you just can't be thinking about maximizing profits and say, "Come on down to the big sale, " and could care less who's on line, and how long they've been on line, what happens on line. None of that, we don't have to plan for that, don't have to prepare for that, don't have to prevent any injuries, nothing, just come on down, let's make these sales, and if anybody gets hurt, just sue 'em. That's basically what's happening. This goes beyond that, at least we talking about a plan, we talking about some preparation for it, precautions being taken to save lives, and stop injury. And I think it does do that, and we can always go further with some other legislation, but it does at least that. anyway, I'll stop, 'cause we're repeating ourselves, I think all of us are saying the same

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 | thing. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Okay, so since I won't be repetitive, I think you got the message from all of the members up here, that we would like the City to come up with something, and to assist us with being able to protect the crowds, recognizing that there are actually more of these type events happening not just on Black Friday but especially in a City like New York with having where artists where come, or where people come with special sales, such as I referred to that's happening on, happening tomorrow in Flatbush, at the corner of Flatbush and - - Avenue at 8:00 o'clock, they're offering gift cards, putting out incentives to the people for the first 100 shoppers. Where we know that's going to be a melee of people trying to get there, where you have, you know, special promotions going on, and you're asking people to come and model. And people got trampled trying to get to a site in midtown. Where you have the situation that someone did earlier this year where they did a promotion with the supposedly bringing old Jets players and offering tickets, and people wound up

2.

getting into a melee and having a fight. There
needs to be a plan to protect other consumers and
the individuals. So, while I don't disagree that
DCA should be the point person, I do agree that
the Administration should work with us to come up
with something sooner rather than later. So, with
that, I want to thank you for being here.

ANDREW EILER: No, we're always willing to talk about how to make things better.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Well, I'm not,
I'm not blaming this just on you, Andy [laughter]
I think the message that from, came from all three
members and myself is that we need to get the
Administration to sit down with us to work out
something, not necessarily your agency, but I
really think that the PD and DOT and the
Department of Buildings should sit down with a
taskforce and come up with something sooner than
later. Because it's now Black Friday, is going to
be almost every Friday between now and the holiday
season. The phenomenon of creating special events
to attract people to come and visit retailers or
to come to events is going to be a regular
phenomenon, not just on Black Friday. And I think

25 CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: I know you

25

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS 49
2	speak loud ,but we have to record it, so if you
3	don't mind speaking into the microphone
4	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Sure.
5	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE:so the
6	recording can be
7	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE:spot on.
9	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Alrighty.
LO	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Thank you.
11	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Alright. We
12	represent, my firm, the estate of Jdimytai Damour,
13	everyone knows the situation that occurred last
L4	Black Friday. And I'm here on behalf of the
15	estate to comment on the unfortunate, to say the
L6	least, events that took place last year on Black
L7	Friday, and the proposed, what I consider life-
18	saving, literally, legislation that seeks to
19	prevent such an incident from occurring again in
20	from occurring again in the future. And as many
21	know, we've been through it here in the last hour
22	or so. Every year the large retailers, Wal-Mart
23	for example, entice customers to attend their

doorbuster sales, the day after Thanksgiving,

which is known colloquially as Black Friday.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These retailers, these big box stores, offer items at large discounts, for only a limited time, and the sales begin in the early hours of the morning. Wal-Mart, and the other retailers, encourage customers to amass outside the entrance of their stores, and literally, quite literally, bust down the doors in order to reap the benefits of the discounted items. Advertising and marketing campaigns for doorbuster sales are specifically designed to create a climate of competition among the customers. Sales only last for a limited time, there're only scant quantities of the discounted products available, encouraging patrons to arrive early in order to literally beat out their fellow patrons for the biggest deals of the This atmosphere of competition, of competitive shopping, saw its natural result in the ill-fated, yet inevitable, culmination last year when Jdimytai was trampled to death by a mob of shoppers at the Long Island Wal-Mart. Wal-Mart attracted the bargain hunters to swell outside the store's entrance, and then promptly at 5:00 o'clock a.m., the floodgates opened. Upon the store's opening, the customers surged into the

Wal-Mart creating a treacherous stampede. The
dangerous conditions were easily, easily avoidable
if Wal-Mart had only properly prepared for the
massive crowds, the consumer frenzy, which it had
deliberately created. There was a lack of
sufficient plans for crowd control, there was no
provision for crowd management training, no tools
that were necessary to safely manage what they
knew to be a substantial crowd. This was in utter
disregard for human life and limb, in that it
created, Wal-Mart created an extremely hazardous
condition, which took the death the Jdimytai, took
his life. The proposed legislation, this
lifesaving legislation, if you will, and I don't
really think that it's saying too much to call it
that, because I'm sure that many major decision,
major bills are passed upon in this room. I think
this is one of the most important ones. It goes
to the very heart of consumers, which is what the
Department of Consumer Affairs should be here to
protect: consumers. In any event. The
legislation calls for retailers to apply for a
license to conduct such a sales event, and create
and implement appropriate crowd control measures.

2	These steps are important to ensure that retail
3	leviathans such as Wal-Mart, are vigilant to
4	protect those persons who are invited onto their
5	premises for the purpose, for the purpose, for the
6	purpose of profit. Unfortunately, greed and a
7	lack of concern for the public welfare
8	demonstrated by corporate giants, too often the
9	companies are holiday season. This legislation,
10	this legislation will compel retailers to consider
11	the safety of their customers first, instead of
12	only their bottom line. This legislation, I
13	submit, Council Members, puts people over profits.
14	Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Thank you for
16	your testimony. We'll hear from Council Member
17	Gennaro, and then Councilman Barron, have
18	questions for you.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you.
20	Sir, if it's okay for you to stand for questions.
21	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Sure.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Is that
23	okay?
24	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Yeah, I'll be
25	happy to.

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	ll .					
2		COUNCIL	MEMBER	GENNARO:	Oh,	sure.

3 EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: To the extent

4 | that I'm able, but--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Okay, sure, and at the outset of your statement, I didn't catch your name, sir, I want to call you by name.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Oh, Edward

Gershowitz from the Law Office of Gershowitz, Libo

and Korek.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Okay. Mr. Gershowitz, first of all thank you for coming here today. We know that your in depth involvement with this tragedy puts you in a good position to speak about the human impacts of what's going on, and you know, certainly you are a legal expert that can speak to some of the underpinnings of the presentation put forward by the Administration, who came here and said that the liability laws as they currently exist are probably the only things that we can do. And it was, I don't want to speak for them, but they basically indicated that those would have to be sufficient to protect consumers. And I would think that you would disagree with

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that, and could you, if you could, just talk a

little bit about how the current legal framework

of liability in these cases is not sufficient to

protect people like your client, and others that

come to these gatherings.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Well, Council Member, I have to tell you, as I listened to the DCA representative, I felt like I had fallen through the looking glass, with all respect. I have an Administration spokesperson for the Consumer Affairs agency, is coming in here telling us that we have lawsuits, and we have a legal system that's set up and designed to protect people. So I had to scratch my head on that one, basically. But to hear somebody say, from the Administration, that there should not be standards in effect which would be able to lessen or abate the number of lawsuits. And not that I'm saying there are a lot of lawsuits that are out there, they're there for very meritorious reasons--to protect the consumers and protect people. But we have the, not to go off on too far a tangent here, but you know, we have building code, labor law regulations and safety standards to ensure that

our workers who are working on skyscrapers and
window washing at high elevations in our buildings
in New York City are protected, and that the onus
is put on the people and the contractors and the
owners who have the ability to ensure that there
is a safe place to work. These are regulations
and standards that are derived, such as here, so
that you will not have such a torrent of
litigation, so to speak, which is what I've always
thought this Administration was against,
basically. So to hear them say they don't want to
impede people from bringing lawsuits, again I was
looking for the rabbit in Alice in Wonderland.
So, the other thing I did notice on the statement
that was handed in by the DCA representative,
concerned that, the Administration was concerned
about taking away people's right to sue, and that
if there had been licensing requirements that had
been adhered to, then people wouldn't have their
day in court. But how is that any different, I
would submit, than the City of New York granting a
building permit to a construction company, to come
in and to do some work. You can't bring a case
against the City just upon the basis that they

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gave a permit to a contractor that wasn't qualified or didn't do the right job and someone gets hurt. This sets a floor, I submit, this sets a good paradigm that will protect people as they wait in line to do their shopping. Especially in today's economic times, I mean, you can't turn on the television and not hear how people are suffering. And for the Wal-Marts of the world, and I go back to that name, but any big box retailer to, you know, object to complying with duly promulgated standards that are set out, that they have to follow, so that they can ensure that there will be rules and regulations and safety concerns that will be adhered to, how can anybody argue against that? It doesn't make any sense to It makes no sense at all. Safety, safety, safety's where it's at. And that we have to protect the people that are out there. And that somebody would come in here and say that we don't want any rules or regulations are standards? mean, how can you do something like that? I mean, how can you tell the Damours, how can you tell the Damours? How can I go back and tell my clients that there was somebody who showed up here from

25

2	the Administration and said that this is not a
3	good thing to do? And they're going to ask me,
4	when I get out of here, and I speak with them, and
5	they say, "How did it go?" And I have to say
6	there was somebody there from the City of New York
7	that said we shouldn't have this? They're going
8	to scratch their heads. So, I just want to
9	commend the Council Person, Gennaro, for
LO	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Oh, that's
11	me.
L2	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Butyeah, I
L3	gathered.
L4	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: [laughs]
L5	EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: For putting
L6	forth this legislation, at least taking a
L7	significant part, if not the lead, in putting as I
18	say, and I've got to back to it, and that's what
L9	we lawyers are about that we're out there for
20	people, that we're putting people over profits.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you
22	for, as I said, for being here and to, bearing
23	witness to what we're trying to do, and how that

can be of help in preventing further tragedies.

Do you have any knowledge, and you may not,

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certainly, of other jurisdictions and what they
may have tried to do to speak to this issue and
provide protections? In your handling of this
case, have you come across other jurisdictions
that have grappled with this and tried to come up
with something that provides protections?

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Well, without speaking particularly to other jurisdictions, I do note that the National Federation of Retailers and Manufacturers come out with some sort of promulgations and rules. And if we're going to rely on a private trade industry group to come out with regulations, I mean how can a municipality, of all places the City of New York, or any governmental entity, not take the lead or be in lockstep in terms of discussing and putting for the these kinds of measure to protect the populace? Just with regard to your question about any other particular regulations that might be in place, I was, woke up this morning to the Today Show, was it? And they were talking about, although, well, whatever the Sarah Palin book, and I think up in Rochester and how there are people getting wristbands, and then they're coming back,

and they have a whole system by which there won't be, if you can believe it, a stampede to get there. There's also the, some movie out there, "Twilight" or something like that, I think, there's a new movie coming out.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Oh, yes, yes.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: All the teenagers are excited about that one, and I heard that they're--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Opens this Friday, my daughter already has her ticket.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Well, alright, so did she get the wristband and stand in line?
Because they're doing that for that, also.

of the, one of the mothers kind of, you know, organized the whole thing. But my daughter has tickets and she's very happy. She's counting down the hours until Friday night, to--

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: And just separate and aside from that, Councilperson, just to go back to your question, I would think that the whole country would basically stand up and

2.

in Nassau County.

take notice of New York City when New York City
does something. I mean, the whole nation listens.
And we should be at the forefront of specific
licensing requirements, so that nothing ever
happens like what happened with our neighbor, and,

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Sure.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: And that the,
you know, I could go on about the whole thing with
the Nassau County District Attorney's agreement,
but I won't, don't think this is the proper forum
for that.

well, once again, you have my thanks, and I'm sure you have the whole Committee's thanks for being here today. We certainly appreciate what you're trying to do for this family that's been so deeply affected by what big box retailers do, and your presence today I think is going to help in our quest to try to get something done here in New York City, that hopefully can be a bellwether for the rest of the country. And I thank you once again for being here. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Chairman, I haven't said so far,

2	but I want to thank you publicly for your support
3	and your sponsorship of this bill. You are a
4	sponsor of this bill, and I thank you for doing
5	that, and for having this, having this hearing,
6	'cause we wouldn't be here if not for your

7 leadership. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Thank you,

Council Member, and I do believe in the idea

behind this bill, I do believe we need to sit

down, and hopefully with the Administration, work

on something quickly. You know. And I hope that

the Administration will open its, open its mind to

getting something done seriously here. Council

Member Barron?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Yes, I just wanted to say, you know, this is, to me, capitalism at its greedy worst. And it promotes competition over cooperation, as you said, it prioritizes profits over people. And even the idea of doorbuster, you know, come bust a door down, you know, they're encouraging breaking and entering, you know [laughs] it's like, maybe we should arrest 'em for that, could we do a citizens arrest or something, when they just use that

2.

title. But I want to go back, you may have
answered it already, but I just wanted to be a
little clearer on their claim that the license
would absolve the store owners for any, you know,
civil actions and legal responsibility, so if we
do license them, that it absolves them from that,
you know.

get a driver's license and you go out on the street--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Hello.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: --to use the Councilperson Koppell's example earlier, and you speed, you just say, "Hey, I got my license, you can't do anything to me"? It doesn't work like that. A license ensures a floor, a license ensures a minimal standard, a license ensures that there's been due notice on the part of the profiteer in this situation, the big box retailer, if you will, that they are cognizant, and they will take into account, that they have a responsibility to the people, the patrons, who are patronizing them, and coming into their commercial enterprise. So, I don't see the fact at all, and

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I find it quite bizarre with all respect, that the mere fact that there is a license will prevent people from being able to exercise their rights to access to civil justice. And the civil justice laws, to digress for just a moment, or maybe to put it back into the spotlight, so to speak, set out certain standards, certain rules of reasonable conduct and reasonable care. And for a jury of one's peers, other citizens to come forth and listen, the best thing we've ever had, the jury system and the Seventh Amendment. And it enables them to hear the evidence as to whether or not in a particular situation, the retailer, for example, has acted appropriately and responsibility, or whether or not negligence has caused, proximately, is the legal term, an injury, or god forbid as in this case, a death. But evidence of particular standards, are some evidence of negligence that can be admitted into the tribunal so that that can be brought before the trier of fact, the jury, and the for the judge to pass on, and to let the jury hear that. That's some evidence of negligence. But I don't understand, and I'm not putting myself forth here as a legal expert by any means, but I

don't understand how it is if someone is licensed
that's prima facie, they use the term proof up
front, if you will, that that's the beginning and
the end of the whole matter. You still have to
show that you adhere to certain standards of
reasonable care. And if there are promulgations
from the City Council or a municipality, then
that's something that can be brought in front of
the jury for them to consider. They'll have their
right to explain away if they need to. But don't
go convoluting, if you will, somebody's decent
legislation, that if anything will save lives and
prevent injuries, and say that that's a wrong
thing to do, because then people won't be able to
sue. I think Council Member Barron had it
correct, when he was talking about sort of putting
the horse before the cart, am I using that right,
in that, you know, they, they're encouraging
lawsuits, and you won't even have to get to those,
if you just adhere to what's basically out there.
COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Exactly.
Thank you very much.
EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Alright. Thank

you very much for the opportunity to be heard, and

on behalf of the family of Jdimytai Damour, who could not be here, thank you very much.

express my appreciation to you for your stepping
up to help the family during its difficult time.

And from your presentation today, I think that if
I ever get in trouble, I'm going to give you a
call. [laughter] Thanks for being here.

EDWARD GERSHOWITZ: Thanks, thanks a lot.

Will declare the hearing closed, unless there's someone else that has anything else they wanted to add. I want to thank Councilman Gennaro for bringing us this bill. I think that I agree with him that the Administration did not step up and take an opportunity to get something resolved here. And while we do have testimony from Lawrence Mandelker, on behalf of the New York Metropolitan Retail Association, that was brought before the Committee, yes, and we are—I'm not sure what he's saying, but it's testimony that he's—and I think he's representing the Metro—oh, yes, the Metropolitan Retail Association. So, I'm

CERTIFICA E

I, JOHN DAVID TONG certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature_

Date November 30, 2009