649

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS } ss.
EASTERN DIVISION

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

CHARLES SAROUNAS

vs. No. 43500

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION,
a corporation

ANSWER OF JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION,
A CORPORATION.

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation, by Heth & Lister, its attorneys, answering the complaint of the plaintiff in this action:

1. Denies that on the dates and occasions in plaintiff's complaint set forth, defendant did business in Waukegan, Lake County, Illinois, or owned or operated the factory, mill, or establishment alleged, or that plaintiff was employed by or worked for defendant.

2. Denies that any fumes, gases, or dusts arose from any work done or process operated by plaintiff, or that plaintiff was exposed to the inhalation of any fumes, gases, or dusts.

3. Denies that defendant knew, or should have known, that the inhalation of any dusts, fumes, or gases to which plaintiff is alleged to have been exposed was apt to

1.

AUG 4 1960

M-

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002496

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13161/1

or did produce illness or disease to the plaintiff of which the plaintiff now complains, or that any such illness or disease is, or was, peculiar to the work or operations carried on or used in said business, or that any such work or operation subjected plaintiff to dangers of illness or disease incident to such work or process to which employees were, or are, not ordinarily exposed in other lines of employment.

4. Denies that the plaintiff was caused to or did, during the time in plaintiff's complaint alleged, or any other time, necessarily, or otherwise, inhale large quantities of asbestos or other dusts or gases through his nose, mouth, or otherwise, or that any such dusts became lodged in plaintiff's throat or lungs, or caused any illness or disease in plaintiff, and further denies that plaintiff was in the exercise of due care and caution for his own personal health and safety.

5. Denies that plaintiff was exposed to various fumes, gases, or dusts of dangerous character, or that any such exposure could or would result in any illness or disease.

6. Denies that plaintiff has contracted pneumoconiosis, or that as a result of any occupational disease or other illness arising out of his work, plaintiff has lost weight, or has been incapacitated or weakened so that he cannot perform any work for which he is fitted or that

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002497

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13161/2

plaintiff has suffered mental or physical pain or anguish, or will continue to suffer such, for any length of time, or that plaintiff has become liable for, or expended, any sums of money in and about endeavoring to be cured, or has been kept from his usual occupation, or lost pecuniary gains which he might have made had he been employed, by reason of any such occupational disease or illness arising out of his employment.

7. Denies that defendant wilfully failed to provide reasonable or approved devices, methods, or means for the prevention of occupational disease incident to such employment; denies that there were in and about said factory, no proper suction fans or other apparatus provided for collecting fumes, gases, or dusts in the room in said factory where plaintiff was employed, or that defendant failed to provide masks or respirators, or other apparatus to be used or worn by the plaintiff to protect him from inhaling any fumes, gases, or dusts in the air.

8. Denies that defendant negligently failed to remove, so far as practicable, by either ventilation or exhaust devices, any injurious fumes, gases, or dusts in the room in which plaintiff worked, contrary to statute.

9. Denies that it negligently caused or permitted premises to be so swept as to raise dust contrary to statute.

10. Denies that plaintiff sustained damage in the sum of Fifty Thousand ($50,000) Dollars, or any sum whatsoever.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002498

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. That there is and was, during all of the time in plaintiff's complaint alleged, in full force and effect, a certain statutory provision, namely, "An Act to Promote Public Health by Protecting Certain Employees in this State from the Dangers of Occupational Diseases, and providing for the enforcement thereof." (Callaghan's Illinois Statutes Annotated, Chapter 48, paragraphs 185-200) in Section 2 of which certain classes of industries were listed, viz:

> (1) Employers engaged in carrying on any process of manufacture or labor in which sugar of lead, white lead, lead chromate, litharge, red lead, arsenate of lead or paris green are employed, used or handled,
>
> (2) Employers engaged in the manufacture of brass or the smelting of lead or zinc,
>
> (3) Employers engaged in any process of manufacture in which poisonous chemicals, minerals, or other substances are used or handled by the employees therein in harmful quantities or under harmful conditions,

and that in and by Section 15, subdivision B-4 of said Act it is provided that no common law or statutory right to recover damages for injury or death exists in favor of any employee by reason of an occupational disease arising out of or in the course of his employment in one or more of the occupations referred to in Section 2 of said Act.

12. That if, as alleged in plaintiff's complaint, the various substances alleged to have been handled by plaintiff gave off various fumes, gases, and dusts in harmful quantities, and which were inhaled by plaintiff and caused

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002499

the illnesses and disease claimed by plaintiff, then it appears that plaintiff sues for disability due to disease incurred in a process of manufacture or labor in which poisonous chemicals, minerals, or other substances are used or handled by the employee therein in harmful quantities or under harmful conditions, and that no common law or statutory right of action accrues to the plaintiff by reason of the injuries in plaintiff's complaint alleged.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

13. That there is and was, during all of the time in plaintiff's complaint alleged, in full force and effect, a certain statutory provision, namely, "An Act to Promote Public Health by Protecting Certain Employees in this State from the Danger of Occupational Diseases, and providing for the enforcement thereof," (Callaghan's Illinois Statutes Annotated, Chapter 48, paragraphs 185-200) in Section 2 of which certain classes of industries were listed, viz:

> (1) Employers engaged in carrying on any process of manufacture or labor in which sugar of lead, white lead, lead chromate, litharge, red lead, arsenate of lead or paris green are employed, used or handled,
>
> (2) Employers engaged in the manufacture of brass or the smelting of lead or zinc,
>
> (3) Employers engaged in any process of manufacture in which poisonous chemicals, minerals, or other substances are used or handled by the employees therein in harmful quantities or under harmful conditions,

and that in and by Section 15, subdivision B-4 of said Act it is provided that no common law or statutory right to recover

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002500

damages for injury or death exists in favor of any employee by reason of an occupational disease arising out of or in the course of his employment in one or more of the occupations referred to in Section 2 of said Act.

14. That in said factory, located at Waukegan, Illinois, wherein plaintiff is alleged to have been employed, there was used in the manufacturing processes carried on therein, certain substances named in said Section 2 of said Occupational Disease Act, viz: lead chromate and litharge, wherefore plaintiff's employer was engaged in processes of manufacture in which lead chromate and litharge were employed, used, or handled, and no common law or statutory right of action exists in favor of the plaintiff herein for the occupational disease alleged to have been contracted by the plaintiff.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

15. That Section 1 of said "Act to Promote Public Health by Protecting Certain Employees in this State from the Dangers of Occupational Diseases, and providing for the enforcement thereof," (Par. 185, Chapter 48, Callaghan's Illinois Statutes Annotated) is in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and Section 2 of Article II and Article III of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, in that

(A) Said Section is so vague, indefinite, and uncertain that an employer may not reasonably know whether he is engaged in a work or process within its provisions, or what illnesses or diseases are peculiar to the work carried on and to which employees are not ordinarily exposed in other lines

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002501

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13161/6

of employment; that no standard of approval is provided so that an employer may know with reasonable certainty what are approved devices, means, or methods, or what is necessary to be done to avoid the criminal and civil penalties provided; that said section places obligations on an employer in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application;

(B) Said Section is an unlawful delegation of legislative power by the legislature of Illinois to the jury impanelled, or the Court sitting without a jury, for the purpose of trying any case under said Section, to determine, ex post facto, the obligations of an employer under said Act, and whether his attempted compliance therewith will be approved.

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION,
a corporation.

BY Kettle & Lusk
Its Attorneys.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002502

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13161/7

SOL ANDREWS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) SS
STATE OF ILLINOIS)

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

CHARLES SAROUNAS	)	
	)	
VS -	)	GENERAL NO. 43500
	)	
JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation	)	AT LAW

AMENDED COMPLAINT

Now comes the plaintiff, CHARLES SAROUNAS, by his attorney, Sol Andrews, and by leave of court first had and obtained files this, his amendment to the complaint heretofore filed herein, as follows:

That sub-paragraph (a) and following of paragraph 7 of the complaint be changed to read as follows:

(a) Negligently failed to provide a reasonably safe place to work in, in this, that there were in and about said premises no proper suction fans or other reasonable apparatus provided for collecting the injurious dust in the air in the said room where plaintiff worked.

(b) Negligently failed to provide reasonable masks or respirators or other apparatus to be used or worn by said plaintiff, which would effectively prevent the plaintiff from inhaling the said dust caused to impregnate and float in the air in and about the said room, and which would effectively prevent him from contracting the diseases herein complained of.

(c) Negligently failed to warn plaintiff of the

AUG 4 1950

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002503

danger of contracting the said diseases, or to instruct the plaintiff as to how to avoid the said danger, which danger was one that the plaintiff did not have knowledge of nor could he reasonably be expected to know of or appreciate or anticipate from the nature of the work or process being carried on.

(d) Negligently ordered the plaintiff, or caused the plaintiff to be ordered, to go ahead with the work in spite of the danger, of which the defendant had knowledge or by the reasonable exercise of due care and caution should have had.

(e) Wilfully, wantonly and with conscious indifference to the health of the plaintiff, failed to furnish a reasonably safe place to work in, in that the defendant, knowing of the danger and having been given notice thereof, compelled plaintiff to go ahead with his work without protection.

(f) Wilfully, wantonly and with conscious indifference to the health and safety of the plaintiff and other employees, refused to provide masks or respirators or other reasonable apparatus to prevent plaintiff from inhaling the injurious dusts.

(g) Wilfully, wantonly and with conscious indifference to the health and safety of the plaintiff, and other employees, refused to warn plaintiff of the dangers.

Plaintiff asks judgment for Fifty Thousand Dollars, ($50,000.00).

Sol Andrews
Attorney for Plaintiff.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002504

STATE OF ILLINOIS } SS
COUNTY OF COOK }

List #7
P.P.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COOK COUNTY

CHARLES SAROUNAS
VS
JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation

NO. 34s7342
JURY DEMANDED

COMPLAINT AT LAW

COUNT I

The plaintiff, CHARLES SAROUNAS, by his attorney, SOL ANDREWS, complains of the defendant, JOHNS MANVILLE CORPORATION, a corporation, and says:

1. That on or about the 26th day of January, A.D. 1934 the defendant, JOHNS MANVILLE CORPOATION, was 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 tiling room, in which tiles were cut from hot slabs; that right next to this department there was another room, in which the ingredients that are used to make asbestos were mixed, and this produced a great deal of dust, which circulated and permeated the department known as the tiling room 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, the plaintiff was in the employ of said defendant and worked in the tiling room, cutting tiles from hot slabs; that he was exposed and

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002505

subject to a great deal of dust which permeated the air in the tiling room from the room next to it, said dusts coming from the ingredients that were used and mixed to make asbestos.

4. That in the carrying on of the said business by the defendant as the same was being conducted 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 operations carried on and used in the 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 the various dusts as aforesaid through his nose and mouth, and said dusts became lodged in his throat and lungs, causing the illness hereinafter 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 dangerious character of 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 disease known as pneumoconiosis, as a result whereof, he has been incapacitated and weakened so that he cannot perform any work for which he is fitted; that he has lost considerable weight; he has suffered great mental and physical pain and anguish and will

continue to suffer for the rest of his life; he has become liable for and expended large sums of money in and about endeavoring to be cured of his illness; 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 disease, 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 about the premises; 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 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 the aforesaid ducts, contrary to Section 13 of an Act concerning the health and safety of employees in factories, mercantile establishments, mills, and workshops.

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

Sol Andrews

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-002507