

10-1-1961

Torts—Risky Conduct by Experienced Worker as Contributory Negligence

Buffalo Law Review Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/buffalolawreview>



Part of the [Torts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buffalo Law Review Board, *Torts—Risky Conduct by Experienced Worker as Contributory Negligence*, 11 Buff. L. Rev. 278 (1961).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/buffalolawreview/vol11/iss1/112>

This The Court of Appeals Term is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at Digital Commons @ University at Buffalo School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Buffalo Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University at Buffalo School of Law. For more information, please contact lawscholar@buffalo.edu.

alleges several separate and distinct theories of negligence, a claim over may be allowed if the recovery sought is based on passive negligence.⁴¹

After examining the plaintiff's allegations referring to Luckenbach's knowledge of Atlantic's torch operations and the storage of poorly packed inflammable and explosive materials on the pier, the Court concluded that the gravamen of the plaintiff's charges was that Luckenbach negligently maintained its pier so as to constitute a fire hazard. The complaint did not contain allegations of passive negligence against Luckenbach which would make Luckenbach liable for Muehlstein's active negligence. Since actual fault was the predicate for liability against Luckenbach, the Court concluded that it could not claim over against Muehlstein. The Court, in making its decision, stressed quite heavily the fact that Luckenbach knew as well as anyone the nature of the materials it had carelessly stored on its pier and that the maintenance problems were within the ambit of its responsibility. The Court reasoned in this context that decisions in regard to the continued acceptance and storage of such cargo after notice could hardly be deemed passive.

Bd.

RISKY CONDUCT BY EXPERIENCED WORKER AS CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE

Plaintiff, in a personal injury action, was awarded more than \$98,000 for injuries received on the job as a structural steel worker.⁴² The Appellate Division modified the judgment by reducing the damages to \$70,000.⁴³ The Court of Appeals, in *McAllister v. New York City Housing Authority*, reversed and dismissed the complaint.⁴⁴ In this case, the plaintiff, who had more than 33 years experience in his field, attempted to crawl through a window frame opening that was only temporarily set in place. The opening proved too narrow and as a result of plaintiff's attempts to squeeze through, the frame fell on him causing the injuries complained of.

The Court found that the plaintiff had various alternatives presented to him whereby he might have entered the area safely. In addition, he knew that the frame was only temporarily set in position. These facts, taken together with plaintiff's unquestioned experience, led the Court to conclude that he was contributorily negligent as a matter of law. The decision merely reaffirms settled doctrine in New York law that conduct involving an undue risk of harm to the actor himself will normally prevent recovery.

Bd.

SUBCONTRACTOR FULFILLING ALL CONTRACTUAL DUTIES NOT LIABLE FOR NEGLIGENT INJURY OF PEDESTRIAN

The plaintiff was injured in a fall on a New York City sidewalk that had been temporarily repaired following an excavation job. Although the Court of

41. Putvin v. Buffalo Elec. Co., *supra* note 38.

42. *McAllister v. New York City Housing Authority*, 24 Misc. 2d 230, 197 N.Y.S.2d 337 (Sup. Ct. 1959).

43. 12 A.D.2d 626, 210 N.Y.S.2d 766 (3d Dep't 1960).

44. 9 N.Y.2d 568, 216 N.Y.S.2d 77 (1961).