

**NEW YORK “CONSTRUCTION” ACCIDENT LITIGATION:  
THE CURRENT STATE OF THE LABOR LAW**

**Presented by Brian J. Shoot**

**Sullivan Papain Block McGrath & Cannavo P.C.  
July 2011**

**Table Of Contents**

I. APPLICABILITY OF LABOR LAW SECTIONS 240 OR 241(6) TO THE WORK AND/OR THE WORKER IN ISSUE .....1

A. The Issue Of Whether The Work In Issue Was The *Kind Of Work* That Is Covered By Labor Law § 240(1) And/Or Labor Law § 241(6) .....2

1. The Meaning Of The Terms “Altering” And “Alteration” For Purposes Of Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6) .....2

a) Installation Of A Clock -- The Decision in *Joblon v. Solow*, 91 N.Y.2d 457, 672 N.Y.S.2d 286 (1998) .....2

b) Alleged “Altering” Of A Tower That Was Scheduled To Be Demolished -- The Decision In *Panek v. County of Albany*, 99 N.Y.2d 452, 758 N.Y.S.2d 267 (2003) .....5

c) Attempted Application To Change Of Billboard Advertisements -- The Decision in *Munoz v. DJZ Realty, LLC*, 5 N.Y.3d 747, 800 N.Y.S.2d 866 (2005), rev’g, 15 A.D.3d 363, 789 N.Y.S.2d 526 (2nd Dep’t 2005) .....7

d) Whether Post-Application Adjustment Of A Window-Strengthening Adhesive Is “Altering” -- The Decision in *Belding v. Verizon New York, Inc.*, 14 N.Y.3d 751, 898 N.Y.S.2d 539 (2010), aff’g 65 A.D.3d 414, 883 N.Y.S.2d 517 (1st Dep’t 2009) .....9

2.	“Cleaning” Within The Meaning Of Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6) .....	14
	“Cleaning” -- The Decision in <i>Broggy v. Rockefeller Group, Inc.</i> , 8 N.Y.3d 675, 839 N.Y.S.2d 714 (2007) .....	14
3.	The Other Covered Activities .....	18
	Whither Wallpapering -- The Decision in <i>Schroeder v. Kalenak Painting &amp; Paperhanging</i> , 7 N.Y.3d 797, 821 N.Y.S.2d 804 (2006), aff’g, 27 A.D.2d 1097, 811 N.Y.S.2d 240 (4th Dep’t 2006) .....	19
4.	The Importance Of “Context” In Determining Whether Work Is “Covered” 240(1) Or 241(6) Work .....	20
	a) The Absence Of Any Nexus To True “Construction” Work -- The Decision In <i>Nagel v. D&amp;R Realty Corp.</i> , 99 N.Y.2d 98, 752 N.Y.S.2d 581 (2002) .....	21
	b) The Role Of “Context” And Of The “Confluence” Of Pertinent Factors In Applying Labor Law Section 240(1) -- The Decision in <i>Prats v. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey</i> , 100 N.Y.2d 878, 768 N.Y.S.2d 178 (2003) .....	24
	c) The “When Does The Job End?” Issue -- The Decision In <i>Beehner v. Eckerd Corporation</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 751, 788 N.Y.S.2d 637 (2004), aff’g, 307 A.D.2d 699, 762 N.Y.S.2d 756 (4th Dep’t 2004) .....	27
	d) Discussion Of Other Context-Type Issues .....	29
	e) Some Recent Case Law Regarding Other Context-Related Coverage Issues .....	38
5.	The Sometimes Problematic Distinction Between “Repairs” And “Maintenance.” .....	40
	a) “Routine Maintenance” Tasks - The Decision in <i>Esposito v. New York City Industrial Development Agency</i> , 1 N.Y.3d 526, 770 N.Y.S.2d 682 (2003), aff’g, 305 A.D.2d 108, 760 N.Y.S.2d 18 (1st Dep’t 2003) .....	45

b)	Whether The Labor Law Applies To Replacement Of Torn Window Screen -- The Decision in <i>Chizh v. Hillside Campus Meadows Associates, LLC</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 664, 784 N.Y.S.2d 2 (2004) .....	47
c)	Correction Of Malfunctions In Cable Television Service: Repair Or Maintenance? -- The Decision In <i>Abbatiello v. Lancaster Studio Associates</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 46, 781 N.Y.S.2d 477 (2004), aff'g, 307 A.D.2d 788, 763 N.Y.S.2d 44 (1st Dep't 2003) .....	48
B.	Territorial Limitations .....	56
1.	Application Beyond The State's Borders .....	56
2.	Application Near Or Beyond The Water's Edge .....	57
a)	Alleged Preemption Of Labor Law §§ 240(1) and 241(6) By Federal Maritime Law And/Or By The LHWCA -- The Decision In <i>Cammon v. City of New York</i> , 95 N.Y.2d 583, 721 N.Y.S.2d 579 (2000) .....	57
b)	Whether <u>A Vessel Owner</u> Can Be Sued Under The Labor Law For An Injury That Occurred On Navigable Waters -- The Decision in <i>Lee v. Astoria Generating Company, L.P.</i> , 13 N.Y.3d 382, 892 N.Y.S.2d 294, rev'g, 55 A.D.3d 124, 863 N.Y.S.2d 164 (1st Dep't 2008) .....	60
3.	Indian Reservations .....	61
C.	Limitation To "Buildings And Structures" .....	62
D.	Application Is Limited To "Employees"; Passersby And "Volunteers" Are Not Covered .....	63
	Alleged Employee-By-Barter Arrangement -- The Decision in <i>Stringer v. Musacchia</i> , 11 N.Y.3d 212, 869 N.Y.S.2d 362 (2008), aff'g, 46 A.D.2d 1274, 848 N.Y.S.2d 762 (3rd Dep't 2007) .....	68

II.	APPLICABILITY OF LABOR LAW §§ 240 OR 241(6) TO THE PARTICULAR DEFENDANT .....	71
A.	Meaning Of The Term “Owners” .....	71
1.	The Boundaries Of The <i>Abbatiello</i> Exception -- The Decision in <i>Sanatass v. Consolidated Investing Company, Inc.</i> , 10 N.Y.3d 333, 858 N.Y.S.2d 67 (2008), rev'g, 38 A.D.3d 332, 833 N.Y.S.2d 12 (1st Dep't 2007) .....	71
2.	<i>Sanatass II</i> -- The Decision in <i>Morales v. D&amp;A Food Service</i> , 10 N.Y.3d 911, 862 N.Y.S.2d 449 (2008), rev'g, 41 A.D.3d 352, 839 N.Y.S.2d 464 (1st Dep't 2007) .....	80
3.	“Ownership” Responsibility, Or Not, As To Off-Site Accidents Arising From The Contracted Work -- The Decision in <i>Scaparo v. Village of Ilion</i> , 12 N.Y.3d 864, 893 N.Y.S.2d 823 (2009), aff'g 66 A.D.3d 1209, 883 N.Y.S.2d 677 (4th Dep't 2009) .....	81
4.	Whether The State Stands Responsible As An “Owner” For Work That Was Done On State Property Without The State’s Knowledge And Without A Legally Required Permit -- The Decision in <i>Morton v. State</i> , 15 N.Y.3d 50, 904 N.Y.S.2d 350 (2010) .....	83
5.	Ownership Of Other Structures .....	89
6.	Miscellaneous “Ownership” Issues .....	90
7.	New York City Arterial Highways .....	91
	Ownership Of New York City Arterials -- The Decision in <i>Albanese v. City of New York</i> , 5 N.Y.3d 217, 800 N.Y.S.2d 538 (2005), rev'g, 10 A.D.3d 545, 782 N.Y.S.2d 37 (1st Dep't 2004) .....	91
8.	Tenant-“Owners” .....	93
	The Tenant’s Burden, Or Lack Thereof, In Seeking Summary Judgment - The Decision in <i>Ferluckaj v. Goldman Sachs &amp; Co.</i> , 12 N.Y.3d 316, 880 N.Y.S.2d 879 (2009) .....	95
9.	Owner’s “Agents” .....	96

10.	Additional Notes .....	98
B.	Statutory Liability Of “Contractors” .....	99
	Labor Law Liability Of The “Construction Manager” -- The Decision in <i>Walls v. Turner Construction Company</i> , 4 N.Y.3d 861, 798 N.Y.S.2d 351 (2005) .....	99
C.	Owners Of One- And Two-Family Dwellings .....	113
1)	The “Multi-Purpose” Rule Of <i>Bartoo v. Buell</i> , 87 N.Y.2d 362, 639 N.Y.S.2d 778 (1996) .....	114
2)	The “Outcome” Rule of <i>Stejskal v. Simons</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 628, 782 N.Y.S.2d 397 (2004), <i>aff’g</i> , 309 A.D.2d 853, 765 N.Y.S.2d 886 (2nd Dep’t 2003) .....	116
3)	The Quantum Of “Control” Needed To Divest An Owner Of His Or Her Right To The Exemption Regarding One- And Two-Family Dwellings -- The Decision in <i>Affri v. Basch</i> , 13 N.Y.3d 592, 894 N.Y.S.2d 370 (2009), <i>aff’g</i> 45 A.D.3d 615, 846 N.Y.S.2d 270 (2nd Dep’t 2009) .....	117
4)	Additional Notes Concerning The Exemption .....	124
III.	LABOR LAW SECTION 240 AND THE ELEVATION-RELATEDNESS PREREQUISITE .....	130
A.	“Falling Worker” Cases .....	133
1.	<i>Runner</i> And The New, “Single Decisive Question” For Elevation-Relatedness .....	133
a)	The New Standard -- The Decision in <i>Runner v. New York Stock Exchange, Inc.</i> , 13 N.Y.3d 599, 895 N.Y.S.2d 279 (2009) .....	133
b)	The Bad Scaffold, Unrelated To Gravity -- The Decision in <i>Gasques v. State of New York</i> , 15 N.Y.3d 869, 910 N.Y.S.2d 415 (2010), <i>aff’g</i> 59 A.D.3d 666, 873 N.Y.S.2d 717 (2nd Dep’t 2009) .....	137

c)	Getting A Handle On Labor Law § 240(1) Elevation-Relatedness -- The Decision in <i>Strangio v. Severson Environmental Services, Inc.</i> , 15 N.Y.3d 914, 913 N.Y.S.2d 639 (2010), <i>mod'g</i> 74 A.D.3d 1892, 905 N.Y.S.2d 729 (4th Dep't 2010) .....	138
2.	The “Almost Fell” And “Tangential” Relation Cases .....	140
a)	The Decision in <i>Striegel v. Hillcrest Heights Development Corporation</i> , 100 N.Y.2d 974, 768 N.Y.S.2d 727 (2003), <i>aff'g</i> , 266 A.D.2d 809, 698 N.Y.S.2d 379 (4th Dep't 1999) .....	140
b)	The “Almost Fell” And “Hurt While Lowering Or Raising” Cases .....	142
c)	Injuries Caused As An Indirect Consequence Of A Fall, And Injuries That Were Only “Tangentially” Related To Elevation Hazards .....	145
3.	The “Unrelated Hazard” Defense .....	148
a)	Fall While Alighting From Ladder - The Decision in <i>Nieves v. Five Boro Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration Corp.</i> , 93 N.Y.2d 914, 690 N.Y.S.2d 852 (1999), <i>rev'g</i> , 256 A.D.2d 106, 683 N.Y.S.2d 204 (1st Dep't 1998) .....	148
b)	The Case Of The Obstructed Ladder Rung -- The Decision in <i>Cohen v. Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center</i> , 11 N.Y.3d 823, 868 N.Y.S.2d 578 (2008), <i>rev'g</i> 50 A.D.3d 227, 850 N.Y.S.2d 435 (1st Dep't 2008) .....	151
4.	The “Vehicular-Fall” Cases .....	153
a)	Alleged Application To Labor Law § 240 To Fall While Alighting From Demolition Vehicle - The Decision In <i>Bond v. York Hunter Construction</i> , 95 N.Y.2d 883, 715 N.Y.S.2d 209 (2000), <i>aff'g</i> , 270 A.D.2d 112, 705 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1st Dep't 2000) .....	153

b)	Alleged Application Of Labor Law § 240 To A Fall From The Bed Of A Pickup Truck - The Decision In <i>Dilluvio v. City of New York</i> , 95 N.Y.2d 928, 721 N.Y.S.2d 603 (2000), aff’g, 264 A.D.2d 115, 704 N.Y.S.2d 550 (1st Dep’t 2000) .....	154
c)	<i>Dilluvio</i> Redux: Alleged Application To Falls From The Back Of Pick-Up Trucks During The Course Of Unloading -- The Decision in <i>Toefer v. Long Island Rail Road</i> , 4 N.Y.3d 399, 795 N.Y.S.2d 511 (2005) .....	156
5.	Falls Through Or Into Floor Holes .....	159
a)	Fall Up To One’s Knee (Or Elbow) -- The Decision in <i>Keavey v. New York State Dormitory Authority</i> , 6 N.Y.3d 859, 816 N.Y.S.2d 722 (2006), aff’g, 24 A.D.3d 1193, 807 N.Y.S.2d 769 (3rd Dep’t 2005) .....	160
b)	Falls Into Holes And Floor Openings .....	160
6.	Falls On Or From Ramps, And Falls From Dumpsters .....	165
7.	Falls Into Trenches .....	167
8.	Collapse Of The Floor Or Other Work Surface, And The Issue Posed By The Collapse Or Failure Of A “Permanent” Floor, Stairway, Or Other Instrumentality .....	170
9.	The New “Elevation-Related” Purpose Requirement .....	179
a)	The Decision in <i>Broggy v. Rockefeller Group, Inc.</i> , 8 N.Y.3d 675, 839 N.Y.S.2d 714 (2007) .....	179
b)	Beyond <i>Broggy</i> -- The Decision in <i>Swiderska v. New York University</i> , 10 N.Y.3d 792, 856 N.Y.S.2d 533 (2008) .....	181
10.	The New Feasibility Prerequisite ... Or Not .....	182
	The Ruling In <i>Berg v. Albany Ladder Company, Inc.</i> , 10 N.Y.3d 902, 861 N.Y.S.2d 607 (2008), aff’g, 40 A.D.3d 1282, 836 N.Y.S.2d 720 (3rd Dep’t 2007) .....	182

11.	The Elevation-Related Prerequisite: Other Fact Patterns And Issues .....	188
12.	How Far Is Far Enough? .....	192
B.	“Falling Object” Cases .....	195
1.	Elevation-Relatedness - Exclusion Of “Same Level” Accidents - The Decision In <i>Melo v. Consolidated Edison Company</i> , 92 N.Y.2d 909, 680 N.Y.S.2d 47 (1998) .....	196
2.	Labor Law § 240 Inapplicable To Deliberately Dropped Materials -- The Decision In <i>Roberts v. General Electric Company</i> , 97 N.Y.2d 737, 742 N.Y.S.2d 188 (2002) .....	199
3.	The <i>Previously</i> Unsecured And Now Falling Object -- The Decision in <i>Quattrocchi v. F.J. Sciame Construction Co., Inc.</i> , 11 N.Y.3d 757, 859 N.Y.S.2d 396 (2008), aff’g 44 A.D.3d 377, 380, 843 N.Y.S.2d 564, 567 (1st Dep’t 2007) .....	200
4.	Other “Falling Object” Issues .....	207
IV.	WINDOW WASHERS .....	218
A.	Resolution Of The Alleged Conflict Between Labor Law Section 240 And The “Window Washer” Statute -- The Decision In <i>Bauer v. Female Academy of the Sacred Heart</i> , 97 N.Y.2d 445, 741 N.Y.S.2d 491 (2002) .....	218
V.	STANDARDS GOVERNING MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT UNDER LABOR LAW § 240, AND APPLICATION OF THE STATUTE TO POOR “PLACEMENT” OR “OPERATION” OF AN ELEVATION DEVICE .....	221
A.	Liability For Poor “Placement” Of A Properly “Constructed” Elevation Device - The Decision In <i>Klein v. City of New York</i> , 89 N.Y.2d 833, 652 N.Y.S.2d 723 (1996), aff’g, 222 A.D.2d 351, 635 N.Y.S.2d 634 (1st Dep’t 1995) .....	221

B.	When It Is For The Jury To Decide Whether “Proper Protection” Within The Meaning Of Labor Law § 240(1) Was Provided -- The Decision In <i>Holly v. County of Chautauqua</i> , 13 N.Y.3d 931, 895 N.Y.S.2d 308 (2010), rev’g 63 A.D.3d 1558, 881 N.Y.S.2d 741 (4th Dep’t 2009) .....	246
C.	Plaintiff’s Summary Judgment Motions Based On Circumstantial Proof, And The Standards Generally Governing Accidents That Were Unwitnessed Or Witnessed Only By The Plaintiff -- The Decision In <i>Felker v. Corning Incorporated</i> , 90 N.Y.2d 219, 660 N.Y.S.2d 349 (1997) .....	247
D.	Plaintiffs’ Motion For Summary Judgment In Cases Involving Unwitnessed Or Witnessed-Only-By-Plaintiff Accidents .....	248
E.	Defendants’ Motions For Summary Judgment .....	258
VI.	LABOR LAW § 240 DEFENSES .....	262
A.	The “Sole Proximate Cause” Defense .....	262
1.	The Plaintiff’s (Or Decedent’s) Alleged Negligence In Misusing The Ladder Or Scaffold, Or Other Device, Or In Otherwise Knowingly And Unnecessarily Creating The Risk That Caused The Accident .....	262
a)	The “Sole Proximate Cause” Defense For Violation Of Labor Law Section 240(1) -- The Decision In <i>Blake v. Neighborhood Housing Services of New York City, Inc.</i> , 1 N.Y.3d 280, 771 N.Y.S.2d 484 (2003) .....	263
b)	Application Of The “Sole Proximate Cause” Defendant To A Plaintiff Who Was Working Under Another’s Direction -- The Decision In <i>Montgomery v. Federal Express Corporation</i> , 4 N.Y.3d 805, 795 N.Y.S.2d 490 (2005), aff’g, 307 A.D.2d 865, 763 N.Y.S.2d 600 (1st Dep’t 2003) .....	288
2.	Plaintiff’s (Or Decedent’s) Allegedly Negligent Failure To Use A Purportedly Available Safety Device Or Elevation Tool .....	291

a)	“Ultimate Responsibility For Worksite Safety” Circa 2006 -- The Decision in <i>Robinson v. East Medical Center, LP</i> , 6 N.Y.3d 550, 814 N.Y.S.2d 589 (2006), aff’g, 17 A.D.3d 1027, 794 N.Y.S.2d 184 (4th Dep’t 2005) .....	291
b)	The Meaning Of “Available” Safety Devices -- The Decision in <i>Miro v. Plaza Construction Corp.</i> , 9 N.Y.3d 948, 846 N.Y.S.2d 76 (2007), rev’g, 38 A.D.3d 454, 834 N.Y.S.2d 36 (1st Dep’t 2007) .....	298
c)	The Rule, Circa 2010, Governing The Plaintiff- Failed-To-Use-A-Safety-Device-Or-Better- Elevating-Device Defense -- The Decision in <i>Gallagher v. The New York Post</i> , 14 N.Y.3d 83, 896 N.Y.S.2d 732 (2010), rev’g 55 A.D.3d 488, 866 N.Y.S.2d 178 (1st Dep’t 2008) .....	309
B.	The “Recalcitrant Worker” Defense .....	315
1.	The “Recalcitrant Worker” Defense -- Worker’s Violation Of Previously Given Safety Instructions -- The Decision in <i>Cahill v. Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority</i> , 4 N.Y.3d 35, 790 N.Y.S.2d 74 (2004) .....	315
2.	The Court Of Appeals’ Prior Decisions Regarding The “Recalcitrant Worker” Defense, To The Extent They Still Matter .....	318
3.	After <i>Cahill</i> .....	323
VII.	THE NATURE OF, AND PREREQUISITES FOR, IMPOSITION OF LIABILITY PURSUANT TO LABOR LAW § 241(6) .....	328
A.	General Principles .....	328
B.	Imposition Of Vicarious Liability .....	331
	Labor Law Section 241(6) Triggers Vicarious, But Not Absolute, Liability -- The Decision in <i>Rizzuto v. L.A. Wenger Contracting Co., Inc.</i> , 91 N.Y.2d 343, 670 N.Y.S.2d 816 (1998), rev’g, 237 A.D.2d 500, 656 N.Y.S.2d 889 (2nd Dep’t 1997) .....	331

C.	Proving Or Disproving The Violation .....	338
	<i>Ross/Rizzuto</i> Reiterated, And An Important Ruling Regarding The Use Of Expert Testimony In A Labor Law Case -- The Decision in <i>Morris v. Pavarini Construction</i> , 9 N.Y.3d 47, 842 N.Y.S.2d 759 (2007) .....	338
D.	The Logic ... Or Illogic ... Of The <i>Ross</i> Doctrine .....	340
	The Case Of The Overloaded <u>And</u> Broken Crane, In Which An <i>Additional</i> , Unsafe Condition Provided A Causal Defense -- The Decision in <i>Pavlou v. City of New York</i> , 8 N.Y.3d 961, 836 N.Y.S.2d 506 (2007), <i>aff'g</i> , 21 A.D.3d 74, 797 N.Y.S.2d 478 (1st Dep't 2005) .....	340
E.	“Integral Part Of The Work” Defense .....	342
	“Integral Part Of The Work” Defense -- The Decision in <i>O’Sullivan v. IDI Construction Co., Inc.</i> , 7 N.Y.3d 805, 822 N.Y.S.2d 745 (2006), <i>aff'g</i> , 28 A.D.3d 225, 813 N.Y.S.2d 373 (1st Dep't 2006) .....	342
F.	The Measure Of Regulatory Specificity That Is Prerequisite For Liability -- The Decision in <i>Misicki v. Caradonna</i> , 12 N.Y.3d 511, 882 N.Y.S.2d 375 (2009) .....	346
G.	Possible Limitation To Industrial Code Rule 23 .....	348
	Attempted Use Of Industrial Code Part 12 As A Labor Law § 241(6) Predicate -- The Decision in <i>Nostrom v. A.W. Chesteron Company</i> , 15 N.Y.3d 502, 914 N.Y.S.2d 725 (2010), <i>aff'g</i> 59 A.D.3d 159, 872 N.Y.S.2d 122 (1st Dep't 2009) .....	348
H.	Construction Of The Industrial Code Provisions .....	349
	Whether A “Front-End Loader” Can Sometimes Be A “Power Shovel Or Backhoe” -- The Decision in <i>St. Louis v. Town of North Elba</i> , 16 N.Y.3d 411, 923 N.Y.S.2d 391 (2011) .....	349
I.	Pleading of Alleged Regulatory Violations .....	351
J.	Open Or Problematic Issues .....	354

1.	Whether An Undisputed Violation That Was Indisputedly A Cause Of The Accident <i>Mandates</i> Imposition Of Liability .....	354
2.	Non-Negligent Violations .....	358
3.	Application Of The <i>Gallagher</i> Standard And Of Sole Proximate Cause Methodology To Comparative Negligence Claim .....	359
4.	Admissibility And Scope Of Expert Testimony .....	361
5.	Other 241(6) Matters .....	365
K.	Rulings As To The Applicability Or “Concreteness” Of Particular Regulations .....	366
VIII.	CLAIMS PREMISED UPON LABOR LAW § 200 .....	413
IX.	EMPLOYMENT-RELATED DEFENSES .....	445
X.	THIRD-PARTY ISSUES .....	453
A.	Whether Construction Manager Was Entitled To Contractual Indemnification On Theory That It Was The Landowner’s “Agent” -- The Decision in <i>Tonking v. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey</i> , 3 N.Y.3d 486, 787 N.Y.S.2d 708 (2004), <i>aff’g</i> , 2 A.D.3d 213, 768 N.Y.S.2d 311 (1st Dep’t 2003) .....	454
B.	Whether The Indemnity Agreement Was Sufficiently Clear For Purposes of Workers’ Compensation Law § 11 -- The Decision in <i>Rodrigues v. N &amp; S Building Contractors, Inc.</i> , 5 N.Y.3d 427, 805 N.Y.S.2d 299 (2005) .....	456
C.	Whether An Employer Has A Contractual Duty To Indemnify Another For Tort Liability Arising From An Employee’s Injury Only Where A <u>Signed</u> Contract So Provides -- The Decision in <i>Flores v. Lower East Side Service Center, Inc.</i> , 4 N.Y.3d 363, 795 N.Y.S.2d 491 (2005) .....	457

D.	Application Of CPLR Article 16 To Common Law Indemnity Claims -- The Decision in <i>Frank v. Meadowlakes Development Corporation</i> , 6 N.Y.3d 687, 816 N.Y.S.2d 715 (March 30, 2006), <i>modifying</i> , 20 A.D.3d 874, 798 N.Y.S.2d 820 (4th Dep’t 2005) .....	459
E.	Not “Grave” Enough For <i>Frank</i> -- The Decision in <i>Cunha v. City of New York</i> , 12 N.Y.3d 504, 882 N.Y.S.2d 674 (2009), <i>aff’g</i> 45 A.D.3d 624, 850 N.Y.S.2d 119 (2nd Dep’t 2007) .....	460
F.	Whether “Partial Indemnification” Can Be Sought Notwithstanding General Obligation Law § 5-322.1 -- The Decision in <i>Brooks v. Judlaw Contracting, Inc.</i> , 11 N.Y.3d 204, 869 N.Y.S.2d 366 (2008), <i>rev’g</i> 39 A.D.3d 447, 833 N.Y.S.2d 223 (2nd Dep’t 2007) .....	461
G.	The Necessary Elements For Recovery of Common Law Indemnification -- The Decision in <i>McCarthy v. Turner Construction, Inc.</i> , ___ N.Y.3d ___, ___ N.Y.S.2d ___, 2011 WL 2534070 (June 28, 2011) .....	463
H.	Other Third-Party Issues .....	465
XI.	ODDS AND ENDS .....	486