STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF C O O K)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COOK COUNTY

NICK BOJKO
VS
JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION
A CORPORATION

No. 34S 2959

COMPLAINT AT LAW

COUNT I

The plaintiff, NICK BOJKO, complains of the defendant, JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation, and says:

1. That on or about the 30th day of March, A.D., 1932, the defendant, JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION, was a duly organized and authorized corporation, doing business in the State of Illinois, County of Lake, and City of Waukegan, at which time and place, it owned, operated, and maintained a factory, mill, or establishment for the purpose of manufacturing asbestos in its various forms.

2. That the said defendant, in its factory, owned and operated a certain department known as the mixing room, in which asbestos, fibre, cement, rock, and other ingredients were mixed together for the purpose of making fibre block; that in the mixing room, certain ingredients were mixed together for the purpose of making rock wool blocks, and during these processes, a great deal of dust from asbestos, fibre, cement, rock, and other materials were caused to and did impregnate the air in said premises in such great quantities as to be greatly deleterious to the health of human beings.

3. That on the aforesaid day and at the time and place aforesaid and for a number of years prior thereto, he was in the employ of said defendant, and worked as a laborer, mixing asbestos, fibre, cement, rock, and other ingredients together

Chicago

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/1

for the purpose of making fibre block, and also mixing other ingredients together for the purpose of making rock wool blocks, during which time, he was exposed and subjected to a great deal of the aforesaid dusts circulating in and about the said mixing room.

4. That in the carrying on of the said business by the defendant as the same was being done and for many years prior thereto had been conducted, the defendant knew and by the exercise of due care and caution should have known that the same was apt to and did produce the illness and disease in the plaintiff of which the plaintiff now complains, which illness and disease is peculiar to such work and process used in the carrying on of said business, to which employees were and are not ordinarily exposed in other lines of employment.

5. That the plaintiff was caused to and did, during the period aforesaid, necessarily breathe in large quantities of asbestos dust, fibre dust, cement dust, rock dust, and other dusts through his nose and mouth, and said dusts became lodged in his throat and lungs, causing the illnesses herein complained of, while he, the plaintiff, was in the exercise of due care and caution for his own personal health and safety.

6. That the plaintiff was in entire ignorance of the dangerous character of the various dusts to which he was exposed and to the specific nature of the disease or diseases that would or could result from the inhalation of the aforesaid dusts, and was never, at any time, informed by any agent of the defendant of the fact that such danger did or could possibly exist.

7. That at and during the aforesaid time and place, the defendant did one or other of the following acts, thereby causing the plaintiff to contract and succumb to the occupational diseases known as pneumoconiosis and tuberculosis, as a result whereof, he has lost considerable weight; he has been incapa-

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/2

citated and weakened so that he cannot perform any work for which he is fitted; that he has suffered great mental and physical pain and anguish and will continue to so suffer for the rest of his life; that he has become liable for and expended large sums of money in and about endeavoring to be cured of his illnesses as aforesaid; he has been prevented and hindered from attending to his usual occupation and business whereby he has lost divers great gains and profits and will continue to lose divers great gains and profits.

(a) wilfully failed to provide reasonable and approved devices, methods, or means for the prevention of said diseases, contrary to the provisions of Section I of an Act entitled, "An Act to Promote the Public Health by Protecting Certain Employees in this State from the Dangers of Occupational Diseases", and providing for the enforcement thereof, in this that there were, in and about the said premises, no proper suction fans or other apparatus provided for collecting the injurious dusts in the air in and around the said premises where plaintiff worked; that the defendant failed to provide masks or respirators or other apparatus to be used or worn by said plaintiff which would effectively prevent him from inhaling the said dusts caused to impregnate and float in the air in and about the said premises as provided by the said statute, and which would effectively prevent the plaintiff from contracting the diseases herein complained of.

(b) negligently failed to remove as far as practicable, by either ventilating or exhaust devices, the aforesaid injurious dusts from the premises in which the plaintiff worked, contrary to Section 12 of an Act concerning the health and safety of employees in factories, mercantile establishments, mills, and workshops in the State of Illinois.

(c) negligently caused and permitted the premises to be swept so as to raise asbestos dust, fibre dust, cement dust,

Chic-20

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/3

rock dust, and other [illegible] to Section 13 of an Act concerning the health [illegible] of employees in factories, mercantile establishments, mills, and workshops.

Plaintiff asks judgment for Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000).

SOL ANDREWS
Attorney for Plaintiff

Chicago

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/4

Thereupon on the [illegible] A. D. 1934 a certain [illegible] of the Office of the Clerk [illegible] to the Sheriff of Cook [illegible] return of the Sheriff [illegible] to-wit.

1st day of March
Summons issued out [illegible] under the Seal thereof directed [illegible] which writ together with the [illegible] and figures following

Ohio 60

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/5

...State of Illinois in the Superior Court of Cook County, Illinois.

NICK BOJKO

Plaintiffs

vs.

No.

JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION,

a corporation

Defendants

To the above named defendants:

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in the above entitled cause.

Take notice that you must file your answer or otherwise make your appearance in said court held in the courthouse in the City of Chicago, Illinois, on or before the first ~~or the~~ Monday in the month of April, 1934, provided this writ shall be served upon you not less than 20 days prior to said date.

If this writ shall be served upon you less than 20 days before said date, you will file your answer or otherwise make your appearance in said court on or before the third ~~(or the)~~ Monday in the month of April, 19 34.

If you do not appear according to the command of this writ, plaintiff may take judgment against you by default.

This summons must be returned, in person or by mail, by the officer or other person to whom it was given for service, with indorsement thereon of service and fees, if any, not later than 5 days after service thereof and in no event later than the date first above named.

Witness, FRANK V. ZINTAK, the clerk of said court, and the seal thereof, at Chicago, Illinois, this Mar 1, 1934 day of ~~March~~, ~~A.D.~~

(seal)

Frank V. Zintak
Clerk

Plaintiff's Attorney (or Plaintiff, if he be not represented by Attorney)

Sol Andrews

Address 160 N. La Salle St.

Tel. And 5808-5809 Phone

~~Chicago~~

PRODUCED
JM - 83

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/12018/6