







LAWYER LOGIN

 $\underline{Home} \ / \ \underline{Browse\ Decisions} \ / \ \underline{A.D.2d} \ / \ \underline{225\ A.D.2d} \ / \ 225\ A.D.2d\ 411\ (1996)$

MATTER OF MURPHY v. BRATTON

Email | Print | Comments (0)

225 A.D.2d 411 (1996)

640 N.Y.S.2d 17

In the Matter of Elizabeth Murphy, Appellant, v. William Bratton, as Police Commissioner of The City of New York, et al., Respondents

 $\label{thm:continuous} \mbox{Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department.}$

March 19, 1996

View Case	Cited Cases	Citing Case	
Petitioner failed to establish entitlement to such benefits by demonstrating that his loss of hearing was the natural and proximate result of a service-related accident, which is a prerequisite to a grant of accident disability pension benefits (<i>Matter of Canfora v Board of Trustees</i> , 60 N.Y.2d 347, 352; <i>Matter of Ortiz v New York City Employees' Retirement Sys.</i> , 173 A.D.2d 237, <i>Iv denied</i> 78 N.Y.2d 864). Petitioner's participation in firing exercises at the firing range was a part of her routine duties as a police officer and the hearing loss sustained as a result was not the kind of sudden and unexpected event necessary to constitute an accident (<i>see</i> , <i>Matter of Schussler v Codd</i> , 59 N.Y.2d 698, 700, citing <i>Matter of Lichtenstein v Board of Trustees</i> , 57 N.Y.2d 1010). Rather, the hearing loss "was a risk inherent in petitioner's regular duties" (<i>Matter of Hambel v Regan</i> , 174 A.D.2d 891, 892-893, <i>affd</i> 78 N.Y.2d 1092).			
We have considered petitioner's other arguments and find them to be without merit.			
Comment			
Your Name			
Your Email			
Comments			
Submit			1000 Characters Remaining
Leagle.com reserves the right to edit or remove comments but is under no obligation to do so, or to explain individual moderation decisions.			

Contact Us

Disclaimer | Terms of Use | Privacy Statement | About Us |

Copyright $^{\circ}$ 2015, Leagle, Inc.