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Erratum
Page 609, line 20. The line should read: "mission of the owner to do work traditionally done by seamen."

This recent decisions is available in Case Western Reserve Law Review: https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/caselrev/vol10/iss4/15
Recent Decisions

ADMARIALTY — RIGHT OF SHORESIDE WORKER TO THE
DOCTRINE OF SEAWORTHINESS

Halecki was an employee of an independent contractor employed to
clean the generators of the defendant's ship. The generators were cleaned
by spraying them with carbon tetrachloride, which emits toxic fumes and
consequently must be dispersed quickly. Halecki received an overex-
posure and died several weeks later, as a result of the failure of the ship's
ventilating system to adequately remove the fumes. Libellant, as admin-
istratrix, brought her action in the New Jersey federal court under New
Jersey's Wrongful Death Act, alleging that the death was caused by the
unseaworthiness of defendant's ship and by defendant's negligence in
failing to provide Halecki, a business guest, with a safe place to work.
The case went to the jury on both issues and a verdict for libellant was re-
turned. The court of appeals affirmed, but the Supreme Court, in a five
to four decision, vacated and remanded the case holding that Halecki was
not entitled to the benefits of the seaworthiness doctrine.¹

Spawned by dictum in the Osceola case,² nurtured by the H. A. Scandrett
case,³ matured and extended by the Mahnich,⁴ Sieracki,⁵ and Hawn
cases,⁶ the doctrine of seaworthiness has evolved as a non-delegable, con-
tinuous, absolute duty of the shipowner to provide a safe ship for crew-
men and shore-based personnel who come aboard the ship with the per-
not entitled to the benefits of the seaworthiness doctrine.¹

In the instant case the Court held that the work performed by Halecki
was not that type traditionally done by seamen because of its specialized
character requiring highly skilled personnel. The Court further added
that, because of the work's dangerous nature, it could only be accom-
plished while the ship was practically devoid of crew members and could
only be done while the ship was "dead," i.e., generators dismantled and
not ready for sea.

The dissenting justices claimed the majority refused to recognize clear
analogies between the work done by Halecki and that traditionally done
by seamen. They pointed out that because the majority opinion ostensibly
adheres to the doctrines of Sieracki and Hawn, which had extended the

2. The Osceola, 189 U.S. 158, 175 (1903).
3. The H. A. Scandrett, 87 F.2d 708 (2d Cir. 1937).
seaworthiness doctrine to shoreside workers, and because of the result in the instant case, no guide has been given which the lower courts can use in applying this seaworthiness doctrine to harbor workers.

To understand the division of the Court it is necessary to trace briefly the Sieracki and Hawn cases and their impact in this area. The Sieracki case extended the doctrine of seaworthiness from crew members to longshoremen. The results of cases following this decision were mixed, some courts extended the doctrine to include virtually all shoreside workers, while others, chiefly under the leadership of Judge Learned Hand, refused to extend the doctrine beyond longshoremen. The Supreme Court then resolved the conflict in the Hawn case, wherein they stated that the name given the worker was immaterial and the true criterion is whether or not the worker is doing a seaman's job and is subject to shipboard hazards. Since this decision the trend seemed to be in the direction of the expansion of the seaworthiness doctrine, with the main issue being whether the work done was traditionally done by seamen. The lower courts, however, have not been in accord as to what is traditional seamen's work. For example, reconstruction of a ship, structural repairs, repairing the propulsion system while the ship was in dry dock, and repairing a badly damaged ship, have been held not to be seamen's work. However, converting a liberty ship to a transport was held to be seamen's work, and as was cleaning deep tanks, and making substantial repairs. Even the watchman of an independent contractor has been held to be entitled to the doctrine.

The Court in the instant case, while adhering to the principles of the Sieracki and Hawn cases, has held that an employee of an independent