

Washington University Law Review

Volume 10 | Issue 2

January 1925

Master and Servant—Doctrine of Res Ipsa Loquitur Will Apply to Servant Using an Automatic Air Hammer

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Master and Servant—Doctrine of Res Ipsa Loquitur Will Apply to Servant Using an Automatic Air Hammer, 10 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 152 (1925).

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol10/iss2/16

This Comment on Recent Decisions is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

MASTER AND SERVANT—DOCTRINE OF RES IPSA LOQUITUR WILL APPLY TO SERVANT USING AN AUTOMATIC AIR HAMMER.

Ferguson v. Fulton Iron Works, 259 S. W. (Mo.) 811.

Plaintiff, an employee of defendant, was engaged in chipping rough metal projections from metal castings with an automatic air hammer containing a chisel. While engaged in working with this apparatus, the hammer vibrated, causing metal castings to fly out, thus injuring the sight of one of plaintiff's eyes. Plaintiff seeks to recover on the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*.

The Court held that this doctrine would apply to this case, as the rule of *res ipsa loquitur* may be invoked in master and servant cases when the instrumentalities are peculiarly within the knowledge of the master, and when the master is in a much better position to explain the cause of the accident than the injured party.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—LIABILITY TO CITIZENS THROUGH NEGLIGENCE IN INSTALLATION OF SO-CALLED SAFETY DEVICE.

Mayor and Aldermen of Vicksburg vs. Harralson, 101 So. 713 (Miss. 1924).

Plaintiff seeks recovery for personal injuries received by him on account of a severe "bumping" inflicted in driving an automobile over a "bumper". This device was merely a convex portion of the pavement, five inches in height and five feet wide at its base, and extending across the street on which plaintiff was driving. Its purpose was to warn drivers of a blind intersection just on the other side. The bumper complained of was installed only a few days before the plaintiff's injuries were sustained, and replaced a former one known to have been dangerous. The former one was known to plaintiff, and a sign warning of the traffic at the intersection and of the bumper located at the side of the street, a reasonable distance preceding the bumper.

As a result of driving over the bumper the plaintiff was thrown against the steering wheel of his car in such a way that the impact caused an injury to his heart. He was driving at a moderate speed.

Held, an automobile driver is not required to use extraordinary care but may assume that the street is reasonably safe for vehicular traffic. A city is negligent in placing in its streets a dangerous device or obstruction