695

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
COUNTY OF LAKE)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF LAKE COUNTY

ESTELLA HACKER
vs. No. 34859
JOHNS-MANVILLE PRODUCTS CORPORATION, a corporation

COMPLAINT AT LAW

Plaintiff for cause of action against the defendant, states:

I. That on and prior to the 23rd day of December, 1935, the defendant owned, operated, controlled and managed a certain asbestos and roofing manufacturing business in the City of Waukegan, County of Lake, State of Illinois, and in the prosecution of its business did maintain and operate divers mixing, moulding, packing and stamping process for the manufacture of various moulded, compressed, and perforated asbestos rings and packing on washers and various other and sundry devices then and there in the course of manufacture by the said defendant.

II. That at the said time and place referred to as aforesaid and for a long time prior thereto, to-wit: since 1922, the plaintiff was employed by the defendant in the asbestos packing and washer department, and while so employed, maintained and operated divers perforating and punching processes for the purpose of perforating various forms of asbestos washers.

Address
Plaintiff's Attorney

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002457

III. That plaintiff was employed in the aforesaid work in various rooms then and there maintained by the defendant where a large number of employees were employed in the furtherance of the defendant's processes of manufacture, and that in the said operation of the aforesaid machines, divers large quantities of asbestos dust and other finely powdered dusts were caused to be thrown into the air and about the room or rooms in which the plaintiff was required to work, and that as a result of the aforesaid, plaintiff was exposed to the action of the aforesaid divers forms of dust, and did inhale into her lungs and bronchial track the aforesaid dust, etc., as aforesaid.

IV. That said work and processes referred to were work and processes which might produce illness and disease peculiar to the work and process so to carried on and the said work and processes subjected the employees of the defendant to danger of illness and disease incident to such work and process to which employees in other lines of employment are not ordinarily exposed, namely, to-wit: that said work and processes carried on subjected the employees of the defendant, including the plaintiff, to the danger of illness and disease incident to such work and processes to which employees in other lines of employment are not ordinarily exposed, to-wit: illness and disease caused by the action of the aforesaid dusts, asbestos dusts, and other dusty products, and that this diseases are known as silicosis, siderosis, pneumoconiosis, asbestosis, pulmonary tuberculosis, and various other pulmonary and bronchial complications.

Plaintiff's Attorney

Address

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002458

V. That at the said time and place there was in full force and effect in the State of Illinois a certain statute reading in words and figures as follows:

> "Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly, that every employer of labor in this State, engaged in carrying on any work or process which may produce any illness or disease peculiar to the work and process which subjects the employee to the danger of illness and disease, incident to such work and process, to which employees are not ordinarily exposed in other lines of employment, shall, for the protection of all employees, engaged in such work or process, adopt and provide reasonable and approved devices, means, or methods, for the prevention of such Industrial or Occupational diseases as are incident to such work or process."

and that it became and was the duty of the defendant to adopt and provide reasonable and approved devices, means, or methods, for the prevention of such Industrial or Occupational diseases as were incident to the work or processes carried on in the defendant's factory, to-wit: silicosis, siderosis, asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, pulmonary bronchial complications, yet, notwithstanding its duty in said regard the defendant wrongfully, wilfully, and unlawfully failed to adopt and provide and maintain adequate reasonable or approved devices, means, or methods for the prevention of such Industrial or Occupational diseases as were incident to such work or processes carried on in said factory, and that the defendant wilfully violated and wilfully failed to comply with the provisions of the Statute referred to as aforesaid, namely, defendant wrongfully, wilfully and in violation of the statute, failed to adopt and provide or maintain any accurate reasonable and approved devices, means, or methods for the receiving of the dust, etc., occasioned and caused by the said processes referred to aforesaid through suction cleaners, methods of ventilation, masks, or by means

Address

Plaintiff's Attorney

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002459

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13013/3

[illegible] for the prevention of such Industrial or Occupational diseases incident to the work or processes carried on in said factory, to-wit: siderosis, pneumoconiosis, silicosis, asbestosis, pulmonary tuberculosis, and various other pulmonary and bronchial complications.

VI. Plaintiff further states that during her employment and while she was engaged in the capacity hereto-fore alleged, she was required to work in various machines and there was present in the said manufacturing apparatus conducted by the defendant various power driven devices, means which caused the aforesaid dusts to permeate the air and atmosphere and that the said dusts were well calculated to injure the plaintiff's respiratory system, and that the defendant knew or in the exercise of ordinary care and caution would have known that the said process, so carried on where the plaintiff was required to work, was charged with divers dusts, etc., and that the said process was not conducted wholly in the open air, but by reason of the foregoing, did become and was the duty of the defendant under the aforesaid statute to furnish the plaintiff with a service-able mask, to keep down the dust, and keep the premises free and clear of all noxious dusts caused to arise from the afore-said processes of manufacture, and that in consequence of the aforesaid, the plaintiff did continuously inhale into his respiratory system the aforesaid asbestos dusts, and other noxious materials then and there thrown out and into the air, and that by reason of plaintiff's exposure thereto, plaintiff con-tracted and developed a pulmonary condition known as asbestosis, silicosis, siderosis, pneumoconiosis, and various other pulmonary and bronchial complications.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002460

VII. That as a direct consequence of the foregoing, plaintiff became sick, sore, pale, disordered and will so remain during her life, and that she has become greatly emaciated, ill, and suffers great pain and anguish and will in the future so suffer, that she is stricken with an incurable disease, to-wit: asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, siderosis, silicosis, pulmonary tuberculosis, and various other pulmonary and bronchial complications and will so remain during her lifetime; that she has paid out and incurred divers large sums of money in and about endeavoring to become cured to said disease and will in the future lose divers large gains and profits which she would have otherwise made because of said injury to her health, on account of said disease.

Therefore, plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of $50,000.00 and costs of this suit.

Drake H. Berg
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Six North Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois

Endorsed:
"Filed Apr 11-'35
"L. J. Wilmot
"Clerk."

Address

Plaintiffs' Attorney

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002461

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ILLINOIS)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

ESTELLE HACKER)
)
vs.) No. 44473
)
JOHNS-MANVILLE CORP.,)

MOTION TO DISMISS

Now comes JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation, by Heth & Lister, its attorneys, and moves the Court that the above entitled cause be dismissed, and as grounds for said motion defendant shows unto the Court that plaintiff's amended complaint is substantially insufficient in law in the following particulars:

1. That the amended complaint purports to state cause or causes of action by setting forth duties alleged to be imposed by the common law on the defendant, as employer of the plaintiff; violations of such alleged duties by the defendant; and injury to the plaintiff by alleged occupational disease or disease arising out of the employment.

(a) In the absence of valid statutory provisions the case, and during the times in plaintiff's amended complaint stated were, no duty or duties imposed by law in the State of Illinois on the said defendant, as employer of the

AUG 4 19

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002462

plaintiff, regarding alleged occupational diseases contracted by plaintiff.

(b) In the absence of valid statutory provisions there was and is, in the State of Illinois, no right of action at law by an employee against his employer for injury due to occupational disease or diseases arising out of the employment.

2. That had there been, prior to the effective date of the Workmen's Compensation Act, a right of action under the Common Law for the matters and grievances alleged in said amended complaint, such right of action was and is barred by Section 6 and 11 of the Workmen's Compensation Act. (Pars. 143 and 148, Chapter 48, Smith Hurd Revised Statute.)

WHEREFORE, defendant JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation, moves that plaintiff's action may be dismissed as to it; that plaintiff take nothing by her suit, and that this defendant go hence without day.

H, H, & Lister

Attorneys for Defendant
JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION,
a corporation.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002463

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF C O O K } ss.

JOHN J. FLYNN does hereby certify that he is one of the attorneys of record for the defendant JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation; that in his opinion the foregoing motion is well founded in point of law and that it is not interposed for the purpose of delay.

John J. Flynn

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of June, 1935.

Notary Public.

3.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002464

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF LAKE)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF LAKE COUNTY

Estelle Hacker)
Plaintiff)
)
Vs.) No. 38859
)
Johns-Manville Corp.)
Defendant) AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

Plaintiff, for cause of action against the defendant, states:

I. That on and prior to the 23rd day of Dec., 19 34, the defendant was a corporation and was, on and prior to the aforesaid date, carrying on its business in the City of Waukegan County of Lake, and State of , and did maintain, operate and control a plant or factory, in the aforesaid city, county, and state; and in the prosecution and carrying on of its business, the defendant did use and employ and operate, divers machines, tools, and implements in the manufacture of divers of its products and in the course of said manufacture, the defendant did employ a large number of employees.

II. That at the said time and place referred to aforesaid, and for a long time prior thereto, to-wit: since 19 , the plaintiff was employed by the defendant as a asbestos piper and washer , and did handle and assist in the handling of various perforating and pressing machines for / asbestos washer , and the plaintiff, in the

AUG 4 1936

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002465

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13013/9

pursuance of his duties was required to operate and assist in the operation of various power driven machines then and there used by the defendant in the manufacture of its aforesaid products, and was required to work in and about the room in which the aforesaid machines, apparatuses, and devices were in operation.

III. That the plaintiff was engaged in the aforesaid work in various rooms then and there maintained by the defendant where a large number of employees were engaged in the furtherance of the defendant's processes of manufacture and that in the said operation of the aforesaid machines and the handling of the aforesaid materials, then and there in the process of manufacture, divers large quantities of dust of a deleterious nature were caused to be thrown out and to permeate the air in and about the said room or rooms where the plaintiff was required to work; that said dusts were of a nature well calculated to cause injury to the plaintiff by the inhalation thereof.

IV. That the plaintiff was at all times hereinafter mentioned in the exercise of ordinary care and caution for his own personal safety and did not know, nor by the exercise of said degree of care, by one of his experience and intelligence engaged in the same or similar line of work could have known, nor could he be reasonably expected to know of, or appreciate or anticipate, that said dusts were injurious to the health.

V. Plaintiff further says that the defendant knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care and caution

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002466

would have known that the aforesaid dust was of an injurious character and that the continued inhalation of the same by the plaintiff would then and there cause injury to the plaintiff.

VI. That it became and was the duty of the defendant to warn the plaintiff of the nature of the said dust then and there given off as a result of the said processes of manufacture but that the defendant, regardless of his duties in the premises, negligently and carelessly failed to notify, inform, or warn, the plaintiff thereof.

VII. That the plaintiff continued to work in and about said noxious dusts and was exposed thereto, for a long period of time, to-wit: 12 years, in consequence of which he contracted an injury and disease hereinafter set forth.

Count Two

Plaintiff hereby adopts Paragraph I, II, III, IV, V, and VII, of his first count as paragraphs I, II, III, IV, V, and VII of this, his second count, and proceeds as follows:

VI: That it then and there became and was the duty of the defendant to exercise ordinary care and caution to furnish the plaintiff with a reasonably safe place to work; that the defendant negligently failed to observe its duty in the premises in that it failed to furnish:

a. adequate and efficient blowers
b. adequate and efficient ventilating devices
c. adequate and efficient suction fans to collect the injurious dusts as aforesaid

That the aforesaid blowers, ventilating devices, and

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002467

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13013/11

suction fans were then and there available and were then and there being used by employers engaged in the same or similar line of manufacture of which the defendant had knowledge, or in the exercise of the ordinary care and caution would have had knowledge and that the aforesaid devices were practicable and designed for the purpose of collecting and ridding the air of injurious dusts.

Count Three

Plaintiff hereby adopts Paragraph I, II, III, IV, and V, of his first count as paragraphs I, II, III, IV, and V, of this, his third count and proceeds as follows:.

VI. That it then and there became and was the duty of the defendant in the exercise of ordinary care and caution to furnish the plaintiff with proper and efficient masks or respirators to be used or worn by the said plaintiff which would effectively prevent the plaintiff from inhaling the said dust caused to impregnate the air in the room or rooms in which the plaintiff was then and there employed.

That the aforesaid masks and respirators were then and there available and were being used by employers engaged in the same or similar line of manufacture of which the defendant had knowledge or in the exercise of ordinary care and caution would have had knowledge and that the aforesaid masks and respirators were practicable and designed for the purpose of preventing the inhalation of said dusts; that the defendant negligently failed to furnish or provide the plaintiff with proper

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002468

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13013/12

masks or respirators.

Count Four

Plaintiff hereby adopts Paragraph I, II, III, IV, and V, of his first count as paragraphs I, II, III, IV, and V, of this, his fourth count, and proceeds as follows:

VI. That it became and was the duty of the defendant in the exercise of ordinary care and caution to moisten and wet down, by means of water, the aforesaid dusty materials; that it was feasible and practicable to keep said dust down in the room or rooms in which the plaintiff was required to work, by means of water as aforesaid, and that the defendant had knowledge, or in the exercise of ordinary care and caution, would have had knowledge that said method of keeping down the dust was regularly and commonly used by employers engaged in the same or similar line of manufacture, but that the defendant did not observe his duty in the premises, but to the contrary, negligently and carelessly failed to moisten or wet down, by means of water, the aforesaid dusty materials or dusts arising from the processes employed by the defendant.

Count Five

Plaintiff hereby adopts Paragraphs I, II, III, of his first count as paragraphs I, II, III, of this, his fifth count, and proceeds as follows:

IV. Plaintiff further states that the defendant well knowing the danger of the continued inhalation of dusts by the plaintiff and the consequent injury to his

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002469

health, wilfully and wantonly and with conscious indifference to the life and health and safety of the plaintiff failed to furnish a reasonably safe place for the plaintiff to work in, and wilfully and wantonly instructed, ordered, and required the plaintiff to continue with his work without protection by means of blowers, ventilating devices or suction fans.

Count Six

Plaintiff hereby adopts paragraphs I, II, III, of his first count as paragraphs I, II, III of this, his sixth count, and proceeds as follows:

IV. Plaintiff further states that the defendant knew that the aforesaid dusts did then and there imperil, and endanger the life of the plaintiff from the continued inhalation thereof, and wilfully and wantonly and with conscious indifference to the life and health and safety of the plaintiff, ordered, required and instructed the plaintiff to proceed with his work and wilfully and wantonly refused to provide the plaintiff with masks or respirators or other reasonable apparatus to prevent the plaintiff from inhaling the injurious dusts.

The plaintiff concludes each and every one of the foregoing six counts as follows:

That as a direct consequence of the foregoing, plaintiff became sick, sore, lame, and disordered and will so remain during his life, and has become greatly emaciated, ill, and suffers great pain and anguish and will in the future so suffer; that he is stricken with an incurable disease,

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002470

to-wit: siderosis, pneumoconiosis, silicosis, pulmonary tuberculosis, and various other pulmonary and bronchial complications, and will so remain during his life; that he has paid out and incurred divers large sums of money in and about endeavoring to become cured of said disease, and has lost and will in the future continue to lose divers great gains and profits which he would have otherwise made because of said injury to his health, and on account of said diseases, wherefore, plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of TWENTY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($25,000.00), and costs of this suit.

D. J. Bero
F. M. Tarpley
Ste. No. Clark St.
Sta. 5-091
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

Endorsed:-
"Filed May 4-'35
L J Walmot
Clerk."

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002471

AND AFTERWARDS TO WIT: On the 4th day of May A. D. 1935 the said Plaintiff by Leo M. Tarpey, Drake H. Berg and Lloyd T. Bailey attorneys filed in said Court NOTICE, which said NOTICE is in the words and figures as follows, to-wit:

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF LAKE) SS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF LAKE COUNTY

NOTICE

To: Peth & Lister, attorneys for Johns-Manville Products Corporation, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on Saturday Morning, the 4th day of May, 1935 at the opening of court or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, we shall appear before His Honor Judge Ralph J. Dady in the room in the Court House in Waukegan, Lake County Illinois, usually occupied by him as a Court Room or in his abscense before any other Judge sitting in his stead, and then and there move the Court to enter an order permitting the plaintiffs in the following cases against the Johns-Manville Products Corporation to file instanter each of their AMENDED COMPLAINTS, a copy of said complaint is attached hereto which is similar in form through out all of the following cases, at which time and place you may appear if you see fit.

Dated this 3rd day of May, 1935.

Leo M. Tarpey, Drake H. Berg
Lloyd T. Bailey
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

The cases in which we shall present amended complaints are as follows.

34858	Rufus Worthington	vs.	Johns-Manville	Products	Corporation
34842	Steve Clark	"	"	"	"
34834	Clarence Jacobs	"	"	"	"
34843	William Mitchell	"	"	"	"
34841	Alonzo Poole	"	"	"	"
34837	Foster Pool	"	"	"	"
34835	Walter Canedy	"	"	"	"
34859	Estella Hacker	"	"	"	"
34857	Andy Belcher	"	"	"	"
34840	Lester Nixon	"	"	"	"
34838	Frank Lankhead	"	"	"	"
34839	William Cunningham	"	"	"	"
34844	Floyd Dixon	"	"	"	"
34836	David Irons	"	"	"	"
34852	John Tillis	"	"	"	"
34853	Clyde Tarney	"	"	"	"
34851	Steve Ruthkovski	"	"	"	"
34845	Joe Lenett	"	"	"	"
34847	James Simmons	"	"	"	"
34846	Edward Norwood	"	"	"	"
34848	Clarence Caines	"	"	"	"
34850	James H. Nye	"	"	"	"

RECEIVED a copy of the foregoing notice together with copy of AMENDED COMPLAINTS and order this 3rd day of May, 1935, before 4:00 P. M.

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT Peth & Lister

Endorsed:
"Filed May 4 '35
"E. J. Wilmot, Clerk.

AUG 4 1960

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002472

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13013/16

AND ON THE SAME DAY TO-WIT: On the 4th day of May A. D. 1935 being one of the days of said term of said Court the following among other proceedings were had and entered of record in said court, to-wit:

Estella Hacker)
)
vs.)
34857)
John Manville Products)
Corporation, a Corporation)

ORDER

This cause coming on to be heard on the motion of plaintiff for leave to file an amended complaint changing the cause of action herein and the Court being sufficiently advised and having heard the arguments of Counsel;

IT IS ORDERED: That leave be and is hereby granted the Plaintiff to file his AMENDED COMPLAINT instanter.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002473