

Sign fitting company and director fined after fatal fall from scaffolding

- Mr Iftikhar Ahmed Mughal, 64, died four days after falling from unguarded platform.
- Fall of just six feet proved fatal due to serious head injuries.
- Inspector highlights work at height as leading cause of workplace deaths.
- HSE guidance on tower scaffold protection readily available.

A shop sign making and fitting company and its director have been fined after an employee fell from an unguarded scaffolding tower and later died from his injuries.

Mr Mughal, 64, was working for WH Metals Limited installing a metal sign to the front of the shop in Darwen, Lancashire. He was standing on the platform of a scaffolding tower without any edge protection in place, when he fell to the pavement below.

Although the height he fell from was only six feet, it was enough for him to suffer serious head injuries which resulted in him being taken to hospital by ambulance. Sadly, he died from his injuries four days later.



The scaffolding tower without edge protection

An investigation by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) found that WH Metals Limited and its director, who was on site at the time of the incident, failed to prevent the risk of a fall from a distance liable to cause personal injury.

HSE guidance on working at height is available on the HSE website: [Work at height – HSE](#). The preferred method of fall prevention on tower scaffolds is

the fitting of suitable guardrails around the platform. This is a well-known and long-established control measure. If this had been in place at the time of the incident, it is highly unlikely that the worker in this case would have died.

Mr Asad Iftikar, Mr Mughal's son, said: "My father was like a roof to the family, and since his death, I and my siblings have felt alone. He always supported us in everything we did; he would help us make all the important decisions in our lives."

WH Metals Limited of Navigation Way, Preston, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and was fined £45,000. The company was also ordered to pay costs of £4,826.21 and a victim surcharge of £2,000.

Mr Waqas Hanif, the company's director, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 37 of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and was given a 26-week custodial sentence, suspended for 12 months. He was also ordered to pay costs of £4,846.21 and a victim surcharge of £154.

HSE inspector David Hobbs said: "Work at height remains one of the leading causes of workplace injury and death. In this case, a fall of six feet was enough to cause a death, highlighting the dangers.

"This incident highlights the importance of suitable control measures, such as edge protection, to minimise the risk of serious personal injury."

Further information

1. [The Health and Safety Executive](#) (HSE) is Britain's national regulator for workplace health and safety. We are dedicated to protecting people and places, and helping everyone lead safer and healthier lives.
2. More information about the [legislation](#) referred to in this case is available.
3. Further details on the latest [HSE news releases](#) is available.
4. Relevant guidance can be found here: [Work at height – HSE](#).
5. HSE does not pass sentences, set guidelines or collect any fines imposed. Relevant sentencing guidelines must be followed unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. The sentencing guidelines for health and safety offences can be found [here](#).

[HSE launches workplace safety](#)

inspections for motor vehicle repair

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) has launched 1,000 targeted inspections of motor vehicle repair businesses across Great Britain to tackle occupational asthma. Many skilled vehicle paint sprayers develop this life-changing and debilitating disease each year, forcing them to leave their profession permanently.

This inspection campaign will focus on workplaces that use isocyanate-containing paints and coatings – the leading cause of occupational asthma in the UK. Once asthma develops, even small amounts of isocyanate exposure can trigger severe attacks, making continued work in the industry impossible for affected workers.

Legal requirements under COSHH

The inspections will assess compliance with the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations. Under COSHH, employers must prevent or control worker exposure to isocyanates using effective control measures and safe working procedures. They must also verify these measures are working by arranging regular health surveillance and biological monitoring. Both are legally required for workers exposed to isocyanates.

Health surveillance is required when there is risk of inhalation exposure and skin contact during paint spraying activities. COSHH also requires that exposure is monitored using a suitable procedure. Biological monitoring (urine testing) is the most practicable and cost-effective method to assess exposure levels and ensure control measures are effective.

Protecting workers through health checks and testing

Health surveillance involves regular medical screening by competent occupational health professionals to detect early signs of health conditions like occupational asthma or dermatitis.

Biological monitoring involves laboratory analysis of samples taken from workers to detect chemical isocyanate exposure before health problems develop. This provides an early warning for employers to investigate and correct control failures. HSE recommends urine testing as the most practical and cost-effective method for measuring isocyanate exposure.

Kate Jones, HSE's biological monitoring team lead, said: "Biological monitoring, a simple urine test, is a quick and cost-effective way to check that control measures are working and being used properly, giving sprayers, dutyholders and HSE confidence that spraying is being done safely."

Isocyanate-containing materials, commonly known as two-pack (2k) paints,

coatings and lacquers, are widely used for their durability and finish quality. However, when sprayed, these paints release invisible mist that spreads rapidly and can reach dangerous levels within minutes.

Three essential protection measures

Businesses must implement three critical safety measures during spray painting operations:

1. Proper spray booth ventilation – Maintain spray booths or rooms with adequate extraction systems that create negative pressure. This prevents paint vapours escaping into workshop areas and contaminating the wider workplace.
2. Correct respiratory protection equipment – Workers must use air-fed breathing apparatus certified to the appropriate standard. Filtering respirators do not provide enough protection against paint mist and vapours during spray operations. Breathing apparatus should ideally be full-visor type, but half-mask type with appropriate eye protection is acceptable with more frequent biological monitoring.
3. Safe clearance procedures – Display measurable clearance times clearly for all workers to see. Workers must not remove respiratory protection until they are safely outside the spray area, or the required clearance time has fully elapsed.

Consequences of non-compliance

Businesses found to be breaching the COSHH Regulations may face improvement notices, prohibition notices, or prosecution leading to unlimited fines.

Motor vehicle repair businesses can access comprehensive information and materials through [HSE's campaign pages](#) to ensure compliance and protect their skilled workforce from preventable occupational disease.

[Building firm fined after employee killed by collapsing wall in Bath](#)

- Gary Anstey, 57, had just become a grandad
- Inspector slams lack of planning that is “all too common”
- HSE guidance on temporary structures is available

A building company has been fined after an employee was crushed to death when a 1.8m high retaining wall collapsed onto him.

Gary Anstey, 57, from Bristol, was working for H. Mealing & Sons Limited at a construction site at a school in Bath when the incident happened on 19 March 2019.



Gary James Anstey

An investigation by the Health Safety Executive (HSE) found that H. Mealing & Sons Limited failed to properly plan and supervise the construction of the retaining wall at Swainswick School. This led to it becoming unstable when a large load of aggregate was placed against the incomplete wall which was not supported.



Collapsed wall

HSE guidance [Temporary Works – HSE](#) requires that any temporary structure must be designed and installed to withstand any loads placed against it and that it is used in accordance with its design. This includes ensuring appropriately trained operatives are provided with a suitable written design and plan to install to ensure the structure remains stable.



Aggregate at the construction site in Bath

In a victim personal statement, Gary's wife Anne Anstey, said: "Gary's workplace should have been a safe place to work – he should have come home as he always did – and now he hasn't been here to celebrate all the family milestones and that is something that we as a family have to live with."

She added: "Gary was 57 years old when he died. He was always full of life and he had recently become a grandad for the first time. He has missed Scarlett grow up into a funny loving girl and missed out on the celebration of Scott and his wife buying their first house, all the children starting school and many other milestones in our lives."

1974. Mealing & Sons Limited of Northend, Batheaston, Bath pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974. The company was fined £56,775 and ordered to pay £44,000 in costs at Taunton Magistrates' Court on 11 September 2025.

HSE inspector Ian Whittles said: "This was a horrific incident which had heartbreaking consequences.

"It happened because of a lack of planning and coordination, which is all too common in construction activity. With simple clear procedures and appropriate training this incident would not have happened."

Contributions to this statement were made by Gary's wife, Anne along with their two sons Shaun and Scott.

Notes to Editors

1. [The Health and Safety Executive](#) (HSE) is Britain's national regulator for workplace health and safety. We are dedicated to protecting people and places, and helping everyone lead safer and healthier lives.
2. More information about the [legislation](#) referred to in this case is available.
3. Further details on the latest [HSE news releases](#) is available.
4. Relevant guidance can be found here [Temporary Works – HSE](#).
5. HSE does not pass sentences, set guidelines or collect any fines imposed. Relevant sentencing guidelines must be followed unless the

court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. The sentencing guidelines for health and safety offences can be found [here](#).

Construction company fined after child injured by falling cast iron soil pipe

A construction company and its director have been fined after being found guilty of safety breaches that resulted in a five-year-old child being injured by a falling cast iron pipe.

Sage Homes Limited and its director were convicted on Monday 4 August 2025, at Southampton Crown Court, for failing to properly assess a foreseeable risk.

The incident occurred on 20 July 2021, during building work on an extension to a house in Totton – a few seconds' walk from a local primary school. A cast iron pipe fell onto a passing child striking him on the head and fracturing his skull.

The base of the pipe had been broken away by the builder some days before to allow him to excavate into the concrete floor. When a TV cable was freed from the pipe, the top two sections of pipe, weighing over 45kg, fell across the pavement. The cast iron pipe was estimated to date from the 1930s, and both the pipe and the fixings were corroded.



The cast iron soil pipe

An investigation by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) found that Sage Homes Limited and its director, Jason Scorey, had failed to properly assess what was a foreseeable risk. In giving evidence, Mr Scorey insisted that he

could see no need to secure the pipe against the wall.

HSE provides a range of guidance advice: [Managing risks and risk assessment at work: Overview – HSE](#)

On 12 September 2025, at Southampton Crown Court, Sage Homes Limited and Jason Scorey were sentenced for breaches of Section 3(1) and Section 37 of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, respectively. Mr Scorey received a fine of £1,685, with 45 days' imprisonment in default, and was ordered to pay costs of £10,436. Sage Homes Limited was fined £15,000. Both Mr Scorey and Sage Homes Limited were also ordered to pay a victim surcharge.

After the hearing, HSE inspector Alexander Ashen said: "Properly assessing risk to workers and members of the public is a vital part of any construction project.

"It would have been a simple and inexpensive task to secure the pipe once it had been broken out at its base. The fact that the construction work was being carried out yards from a school gate at the time parents were collecting their children should have prompted even more care on the part of the duty holder.

"This case should underline to everyone in the building trade that the courts, and HSE, take a failure to follow the regulations extremely seriously. HSE will not hesitate to take action against companies and their directors which do not do all that they should to keep people safe."

This HSE prosecution was brought by HSE enforcement lawyer Rebecca Schwartz and paralegal officer, Melissa Wardle.

Further information

1. [The Health and Safety Executive](#) (HSE) is Britain's national regulator for workplace health and safety. We are dedicated to protecting people and places, and helping everyone lead safer and healthier lives.
 2. More information about the [legislation](#) referred to in this case is available.
 3. Further details on the latest [HSE news releases](#) is available.
 4. HSE does not pass sentences, set guidelines or collect any fines imposed. Relevant sentencing guidelines must be followed unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. The sentencing guidelines for health and safety offences can be found [here](#).
-

Company fined after worker run over by forklift truck

Qube Containers Limited, which operates on Ipswich docks, has been fined £30,000 after an employee was run over and dragged by a forklift causing serious injuries to his ankle.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) brought the prosecution following its investigation of the incident involving Harvey Addison, from Ipswich, on 11 December 2023.

Mr Addison was unloading cars from shipping containers at the company's site in Ipswich. Working with the driver of the forklift truck to empty two small bins, filled with waste packaging, including ratchet straps and chocks, into a larger commercial waste bin.

The two tipping bins had been positioned on a pallet, which was being carried on the forks of the forklift truck.



The forklift truck involved in the incident with two bins on a pallet

The 21-year-old was standing on the pallet and as the forklift truck moved some of the straps fell from the full waste bins, trailing on the floor and getting caught in the wheels of the lift truck. One of these straps got caught on his foot pulling him to the ground and the forklift truck drove over his foot.

Mr Addison remained in hospital for nine days, requiring skin grafts on the outside of his left calf and behind his left thigh just above his knee. He also sustained a broken ankle.

An investigation by HSE identified that Qube Containers Limited failed to provide equipment that was safe and suitable for the task and failed to risk assess the system of work for emptying the bins – which was found to be

unsafe.

In addition, the traffic routes were not organised in a safe manner, and it was clear from the work practices on site that vehicles and pedestrians circulated in close proximity.

Qube Containers Limited of Forbes Business Centre, Kempson Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974. They were fined £30,000 and ordered to pay £3,752 in costs at Norwich Magistrate's Court on 12 September 2025.

HSE Inspector Adepeju Sogadgi said: "This injury could easily have been prevented. Employers introducing new processes should make sure they assess the work activity sufficiently and apply effective control measures to minimise the risk. There should be systems in place to ensure safety and the risk should have been considered and documented."

This HSE prosecution was brought by HSE enforcement lawyer Julian White and paralegal officer Hannah Snelling.

Further information

1. [The Health and Safety Executive](#) (HSE) is Britain's national regulator for workplace health and safety. We are dedicated to protecting people and places, and helping everyone lead safer and healthier lives.
2. More information about the [legislation](#) referred to in this case is available.
3. Further details on the latest [HSE news releases](#) is available.
4. Relevant guidance can be found at [Workplace transport – HSE](#).
5. HSE does not pass sentences, set guidelines or collect any fines imposed. Relevant sentencing guidelines must be followed unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. The sentencing guidelines for health and safety offences can be found [here](#).