

**Construction Accident Litigation Update:
The Pertinent New York Law**

**Completed August 2019
[Cases through August 13, 2019]**

**Brian J. Shoot
Sullivan Papain Block McGrath & Cannavo, P.C.**

Table Of Contents

I.	Scope Of Labor Law §§ 240 and 241: The Places And Activities To Which Those Statutes Apply, And The Persons Whom the Statutes Benefit	1
A.	Covered Work	1
1.	The Construction/Demolition Issue	1
2.	The <i>Prats</i> Or Relatedness Issue	2
(a)	Sufficiently Related To Covered Work, Or Issue Triable	2
(b)	Not Sufficiently Related To Covered Work	4
3.	“Altering”	6
	“Altering” Of A Billboard — <i>Saint v Syracuse Supply Co.</i> , 25 NY3d 117 [2015], <i>rev’g</i> 110 AD3d 1470 [4th Dept 2013]	6
4.	“Cleaning”	9
5.	“Repairing”	10
B.	Territorial Limitations	12
1.	Labor Law §§ 240 and 241[6] Apply Only Within State	12
2.	Maritime Boundary	12

C.	Covered Plaintiffs	13
1.	Apply Only To Persons “Employed,” Not To “Volunteers” Or Contract Vendees	13
2.	But Contractors And Higher-Ups Can Be “Employees”	13
3.	Purportedly Unauthorized Work	14
D.	Limitation To Buildings Or Structures	15
II.	Defendants Who Are Subject To Statutory Liability Under Labor Law §§ 240 Or 241(6)	16
A.	Owners In General	16
B.	Lessees And Licensees	17
C.	Construction Managers, Contractors, General Contractors, Etc.	19
1.	General Rule	19
2.	General Contractor, In Name Or <i>De Facto</i>	19
3.	Construction Managers (And The Like)	20
4.	Site Safety Consultants	22
5.	“Ordinary” Contractors And Subcontractors	22
(a)	Lacking Control	22
(b)	In Control	23
6.	“Agents”	24
D.	Exemption For Certain Owners Of One And Two-Family Dwellings Who Do Not Direct And Control The Work	26
1.	General Principles	26
2.	Direction And Control	26
3.	Residential/Commercial Issues	28

4.	Miscellaneous	29
III.	Liability Under Labor Law § 240	30
A.	“Absolute” Liability	30
B.	“Elevation-Relatedness”	30
	The Governing Standard For Elevation-Relatedness -- The Decision in <i>Runner v New York Stock Exch., Inc.</i> , 13 NY3d 599 [2009]	31
1.	<i>Runner</i> Followed	33
2.	<i>Runner</i> Distinguished	34
C.	<i>O’Brien</i> And The “Feasible” “Safety Device” Issue	35
	Whether Wet, Slippery, Exterior Stairs Were, As A Matter Of Law, Violative Of Labor Law § 240[1] — <i>O’Brien v Port Auth. of New York and New Jersey</i> , 29 NY3d 27 [2017], <i>mod’g</i> 131 AD3d 823 [1st Dept 2015]	35
D.	“Integral To The Work” Defense	39
E.	Other “Falling Worker” Issues	40
1.	“Almost Fell” Cases	40
2.	Alleged <i>De Minimis</i> Falls And “Ordinary Work Hazards”	40
3.	Falls Through Or Into Holes And Openings	41
4.	Falls From Ladders, Scaffolds, Etc., Precipitated By Electrical Shocks	43
	Whether Plaintiff Who Received An Electrical Shock And Fell Was Thereby Entitled To Summary Judgment Under Labor Law § 240[1] — <i>Nazario v 222 Broadway, LLC</i> , 28 NY3d 1054 [2016], <i>mod’g</i> 135 AD3d 506 [1st Dept 2016]	43
5.	Cases Involving Failure Of A “Permanent” Floor, Stairway, Or Other Instrumentality	44
6.	The Rest	46

F.	Other “Falling Object” Issues	46
1.	General Rule Regarding “Falling Objects,” Including The Fall Of Permanently Installed Objects	46
	Whether The Subject Falling Pipe Came Within The Ambit Of Labor Law § 240 -- <i>Fabrizi v 1095 Ave. of Americas, L.L.C.</i> , 22 NY3d 658 [2014], <i>rev’g</i> 98 AD3d 864 [1st Dept 2012]	46
2.	Rethinking Of The “Same Level” Rule	48
3.	Objects Dropped <i>While</i> Being Hoisted, Lifted, Carried, Emptied, Or Rolled	48
4.	Objects That Were Thrown, Or Which Fell For Unknown Reasons	49
5.	Claim That Fall Was Not Due To Absence Or Inadequacy Of A “Safety” Device	49
6.	Allegedly De Minimis Elevation Risks	50
7.	Objects That Did, Or Did Not, Require “Securing For The Purposes Of The Undertaking”	52
IV.	Summary Judgment Motions And Standards In Labor Law § 240 Cases	53
A.	Summary Judgment Because Elevation Or Safety Device Broke Or Collapsed	53
B.	Summary Judgment Because No Safety Device Was Provided	56
C.	Summary Judgment Granted Or Denied For Improper “Placement” Of A Device (<i>e.g.</i> , Unsecured Ladder)	59
D.	Summary Judgment Because Safety/Elevation Device Was “Inappropriate” Or “Inadequate,” Or Denied Because That Issue Was Triable, Or Granted To Defendant Because The Device Was Clearly Not Inappropriate Or Inadequate	63
E.	Material Issues Of Fact Precluding Summary Judgment	65

F.	Immaterial Factual Issues That Did Not Preclude The Grant of Summary Judgment	68
G.	Unwitnessed Or Witnessed-Only-By-Plaintiff Accidents	71
H.	Other Failures To Raise A Bona Fide Issue Of Fact	73
I.	Defense Motions For Summary Judgment	73
J.	Allegedly Premature Motions	73
	Whether Plaintiffs’ Motion For Summary Judgment Under Labor Law § 240 Was “Premature” — <i>Somereve v Plaza Constr. Corp.</i> , 31 NY3d 936 [2018], <i>rev’g</i> 136 AD3d 537 [1st Dept 2016]	73
K.	Evidentiary Issues Concerning Party Admissions, Accident Reports, And/Or OSHA Findings	76
V.	The “Sole Proximate Cause” And “Recalcitrant Worker” Defenses	77
A.	The Defenses Before And During The 1990’s	77
B.	<i>Blake to Robinson</i>	78
C.	<i>Gallagher</i>	78
D.	The Court Of Appeals’ Post- <i>Gallagher</i> Rulings	78
(1)	Sole Proximate Cause And The “Plaintiff Wasn’t The Only Fool” Issue — <i>Barreto v Metro. Transp. Auth.</i> , 25 NY3d 426 [2015]	78
(2)	Alleged Defense That The Worker Was Solely At Fault For Not <i>Building</i> A Better Scaffold Or Other Elevation Device — <i>Batista v Manhattanville Coll.</i> , 28 NY3d 1093 [2016], <i>mod’g</i> 138 AD3d 572 [1st Dept 2016]	80
(3)	Whether Worker Was Solely At Fault For Not <i>Building</i> Or <i>Using</i> A Better Ramp — <i>Valente v Lend Lease (US) Const. LMB, Inc.</i> , 29 NY3d 1104 [2017], <i>rev’g</i> 143 AD3d 625 [1st Dept 2016]	81

E.	The Present Tense: <i>Gallagher</i> And <i>Blake</i> Issues	82
1.	<i>Gallagher</i> Issues	82
	(a) Whether Elevating Device Was “Readily Available”	82
	(b) Defendant Failed To Prove That The Worker Knew The Device Was Available And Knew That He Or She Was Expected To Use It	83
	(c) Defendant Failed To Prove That Plaintiff Did As He Or She Did For “No Good Reason”	84
	(d) Defendant Failed To Prove Some Combination Of The Above	84
	(e) Plaintiff’s Conduct Was Not The “ <u>Sole</u> Proximate Cause” Of The Accident	85
	(f) Defense Established As A Matter Of Law, Or Triable	85
2.	<i>Blake</i> Issues	87
	(a) Defense Rejected Because The Worker Was Instructed To Do As He Or She Did, Or Had No Choice In The Matter	87
	(b) Defense Rejected Because Conduct Was “Mere Comparative Negligence,” Or Occurred Under Emergency Circumstances	87
	(c) Defense Rejected: Because Worker Should Not Be Required To Engage In Conduct That Would Have Been Violative of Law	88
	(d) Defense Rejected: Worker’s Conduct Was Not The Sole Proximate Cause Of The Accident	89
	(e) Defense Rejected On Other Grounds	90
	(f) Defense Deemed Viable Or Triable	91

VI.	The Standards For Recovery Under Labor Law § 241(6)	95
A.	Nature Of Liability, The Elements to Be Proven	95
B.	Pleading And Disclosure	95
C.	Defendant’s Burden On Moving For Summary Judgment	96
D.	Construction Of The Regulations	96
	Construction Of The Regulatory Term “Forms” ... Again — The Decision in <i>Morris v Pavarini Const.</i> , 22 NY3d 668 [2014], <i>aff’g</i> 98 AD3d 841 [1st Dept 2012]	96
E.	Plaintiffs’ Motions for Summary Judgment	98
F.	“Integral To The Work” Defense	101
G.	Sole Proximate Cause Defense	102
H.	Whether Particular Regulations Are Applicable And Sufficiently “Concrete”	102
	1. Defendant Prevails At Least In Part As A Matter Of Law	102
	2. Plaintiffs’ Claims Are At Least In Part Viable Or Triable	108
VII.	Standards Governing Recovery Under Labor Law § 200	114
A.	Codification Of The Common Law Duty To Provide A Safe Place To Work	114
B.	Where Plaintiff Contends That The Subject Accident Was Caused By The Alleged Negligence Of The Contractors (“The Means And Methods Of The Work”)	114
C.	Where Plaintiff Contends That The Accident Was Caused By A Premises Defect	120
D.	Where Plaintiff Contends That The Accident Was Caused By Negligence Of The Contractors <u>And</u> A Premises Defect	126
E.	Where Plaintiff Contends That Defendant Provided A Defective Tool And That Such Caused The Accident	127

F.	Where Defendant Caused The Condition That Caused The Accident	127
G.	The Distinction Between Liability Under Labor Law § 200 And Common-Law Liability	128
H.	Conditions Claimed To Be “Open And Obvious”	129
I.	Odds & Ends	130
VIII.	Employment Issues	131
A.	Collateral Estoppel	131
B.	“Alter Ego”	131
C.	Special Employer	132
D.	Joint Venturers	133
E.	Employer’s Failure To Procure Workers’ Compensation	133
IX.	Third-Party Claims And Issues	133
A.	Common-Law Indemnification	133
1.	Lead Cases	133
	Whether The Employer Of An Undocumented Alien Can Assert The Statutory Workers’ Compensation Bar To Third-Party Claims For Contribution And Indemnification — <i>New York Hosp. Med. Ctr. of Queens v Microtech Contr. Corp.</i> , 22 NY3d 501 [2014]	133
2.	Recent Case Law	134
(a)	Triable Issues	134
(b)	No Basis For Liability	134
3.	Indemnification Established	135

B.	Contractual Indemnification	135
1.	Indemnity Agreements Strictly Construed	135
2.	Oral Agreements To Indemnify	136
3.	Potential Limitations Arising From General Obligations Law § 5-322.1	136
4.	Not All Indemnification Provisions Are Equal	137
	(a) Narrowly Drafted Provisions, Requiring Proof Of Negligence	137
	(b) Broad Indemnity Provisions, Requiring Only That The Claim Arose From The Work	137
5.	Retroactive Effect	139
6.	Triable Issues	139
7.	Entitlement To Indemnification As A Matter of Law	140
8.	Odds & Ends	140