



یسول ایوی ایشن اتھارٹی

AIRCRAFT COLLISION WITH
LIGHT POLE INCIDENT INVESTIGATION

F-27 AP - BAO

WHICH OCCURRED ON
14TH NOVEMBER, 1991

AT

HYDERABAD AIRPORT

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY
KARACHI, PAKISTAN
AIRCRAFT INCIDENT INVESTIGATION

TAXYING INCIDENT TO PIA F-27 AP-BAO ON 14-11-1991
AT HYDERABAD AIRPORT IN WHICH AIRCRAFT HIT
THE ELECTRIC POLE

Authority: Director General, Civil Aviation Authority
Memorandum NO.HQ.CAA/1901/140/AIB
dated 19th November, 1991.

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1. F-27 aircraft AP-BAO operating PK-601 Islamabad - Karachi made a transit landing at Hyderabad. The flight was uneventful. However during taxi for parking on the apron, the aircraft was manoeuvred too close to the edge of the apron. This caused the right wing to touch the flood light pole. The flood light pole was bent to its limit. The right wing tip rubber de-icing boots of the aircraft was damaged.
- 1.2. The incident was informed by the Captain to the control tower but due to misunderstanding the Accident Investigation Board did not come to know of this occurrence for five days. The aircraft after minor repair (damaged boots were covered with hi-speed tapes) flew back to Karachi. There is no qualified engineer at Hyderabad to clear the aircraft, should such an incident occur.

2. FINDINGS

- 2.1. Following are the findings in the subject incident:-

/2.1.1. The aircraft

2.1.1. The aircraft landed at Hyderabad at 1116 GMT, The Control Tower handed over the aircraft to the Marshaller on ground.

2.1.2. The Captain of the aircraft did not follow the Marshaller and manoeuvred the aircraft too far on the edge of the apron even though there was no other aircraft parked.

2.1.3. There are no Yellow taxi guide lines on the apron at Hyderabad.

2.1.4. The Pilot did not utilize the services of the Co-Pilot to obtain clearance on the right. The Co-Pilot, as per SOPs in Flight Crew Operators Manual, failed to perform his duties by not giving clearance to his Captain on the right. (Appendix - 'F').

2.1.5. The Pilot-in-Command instead of informing PIA Operations/Maintenance informed the Control Tower of the incident. He should not have take-off from Hyderabad until the aircraft was checked by a qualified maintenance engineer.

2.1.6. The impact between the wing and the pole was so intense that it bent the thick light pole to its limit (Appendix-B₇'). In this case it was extremely important that a thorough examination of the wing,

wing spars and wing joints etc should have been carried out by a qualified maintenance engineer.

X 2.1.7. The aircraft after thorough check should have been then declared Airworthy as per procedure. This was not done as the incident was not reported to the Airworthiness CAA.

2.1.8. The aircraft was not inspected properly at Karachi on arrival. It was cleared for Karachi + Islamabad flight without inspection/repair by AME M. Hanif Butt.

1 2.1.9. The pilot made a casual entry in the technical log (Appendix- 'G'). He did not brief the engineer properly so that the aircraft could have been checked thoroughly. The reason for this may be due to that the Pilot was involved in an incident at Gwadar (7 over-shoots at Gwadar on 8-6-91) and wanted to keep a low profile.

2 2.1.10. The Pilot-in-Command should not have taken off from Hyderabad unless cleared by Airworthiness CAA. By doing so he jeopardized the life of all the passengers on board the aircraft. He thus violated rule 155 pertaining to negligent operation of the aircraft and rule 325 of CAR 1978. Pertaining to written notification in case of incident.

Rule 325 states that:

"325.(1) Where as incident occurs to a registered a/c the pilot in command, the owner, the operator and the hirer (if any) shall each be responsible for ensuring that a written notification of the incident is furnished to the Director-General within forty-eight hours after the occurrence.

/(2) The

(2). The notification referred to in sub-rule (1) shall contain the same particulars mutatis mutandis, in relation to the incident as are specified in relation to an accident in rule 323."

3. CAUSE

- 3.1. The cause of the incident was that the Pilot-in-Command did not follow the ground marshaller and instead went too close to the edge of the apron leaving no clearance between flood light pole and the wing.
- 3.2. The contributory factors being that the Co-Pilot who occupied the right seat failed to give clearance as per SOP in Flight Crew Operators Manual of PIAC.
- 3.3. There are no taxi guide lines on the apron at Hyderabad.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1. Action may be taken against the Pilot-in-Command for violation of rule 155 and 325 of CAR 1978.
- 4.2. Action may be taken against the Co-Pilot for failing to give clearance to the Captain and not following the SOP in Flight Crew Operators Manual thereby violating rule 251(9) of CAR 1978.
- 4.3. The benefit of the doubt has been given to Mr.M.Hanif Butt AME Lic No.1176 that the incident was not reported properly to him. He may be cautioned to be more careful in future while attending to aircraft after an incident.

E-40AC
E 45/A

4.4. Taxi guide line should be marked at all Airports (which do not have taxi line).

E-41-A

4.5. All crew should be reminded from time to time that reporting of incident/accident to CAA is also their responsibility as per rule 325 of CAR 1978.

APP 'C1'



APP 'C2'



APP 'C3'



APP 'C4'



APP 'C5'



APP 'C6'



APP 'C7'



APP 'C8'

