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 Prats 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


4. “Cleaning” ...............................................................................................................9

5. “Repairing” .......................................................................................................10

B. Territorial Limitations .................................................................................................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 De Facto ............................................ 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


      1. Runner Followed .......................................................................33
         2. Runner Distinguished ...............................................................34

   C. O’Brien And The “Feasible” “Safety Device” Issue ....................35


   D. “Integral To The Work” Defense ..................................................39

   E. Other “Falling Worker” Issues ......................................................40

      1. “Almost Fell” Cases ..................................................................40
      2. Alleged De Minimis 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


      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 -- *Fabrizi v 1095 Ave. of Americas, L.L.C.*, 22 NY3d 658 [2014], rev’g 98 AD3d 864 [1st Dept 2012] ........................................................................................................46

2. Rethinking Of The “Same Level” Rule .................................................48

3. Objects Dropped *While* 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 (e.g., 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


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. Blake to Robinson .......................................................................................78

C. Gallagher ....................................................................................................78

D. The Court Of Appeals’ Post-Gallagher Rulings ............................................78


(2) Alleged Defense That The Worker Was Solely At Fault For Not Building A Better Scaffold Or Other Elevation Device — Batista v Manhattanville Coll., 28 NY3d 1093 [2016], mod’g 138 AD3d 572 [1st Dept 2016] .................................................................80

(3) Whether Worker Was Solely At Fault For Not Building Or Using A Better Ramp — Valente v Lend Lease (US) Const. LMB, Inc., 29 NY3d 1104 [2017], rev’g 143 AD3d 625 [1st Dept 2016] ............................................................................................................81
E. The Present Tense: *Gallagher And Blake* Issues ...........................................82

1. *Gallagher* 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 “Sole Proximate Cause” Of The Accident ......................85
   
   (f) Defense Established As A Matter Of Law, Or Triable ..............................................85

2. *Blake* 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 Morris v Pavarini Const., 22 NY3d 668 [2014], aff’g 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 And 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


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