

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
199500099**

**Piper Aircraft Corp
Seneca**

12 January 1995

Readers are advised that the Australian Transport Safety Bureau investigates for the sole purpose of enhancing transport safety. Consequently, Bureau reports are confined to matters of safety significance and may be misleading if used for any other purposes.

Investigations commenced on or before 30 June 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with Part 2A of the Air Navigation Act 1920.

Investigations commenced after 1 July 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with the Transport Safety Investigation Act 2003 (TSI Act). Reports released under the TSI Act are not admissible as evidence in any civil or criminal proceedings.

NOTE: All air safety occurrences reported to the ATSB are categorised and recorded. For a detailed explanation on Category definitions please refer to the ATSB website at www.atsb.gov.au.

The Bureau did not conduct an on scene investigation of this occurrence. The information presented below was obtained from information supplied to the Bureau.

Occurrence Number: 199500099 **Occurrence Type:** Accident
Location: Parafield
State: SA **Inv Category:** 4
Date: Thursday 12 January 1995
Time: 1618 hours **Time Zone** CSuT
Highest Injury Level: None

Aircraft Manufacturer: Piper Aircraft Corp
Aircraft Model: PA-34-200
Aircraft Registration: VH-SVS **Serial Number:** 34-7350172
Type of Operation: Instructional Dual
Damage to Aircraft: Substantial
Departure Point: Parafield SA
Departure Time: 1600 CSuT
Destination: Parafield SA

Crew Details:

Role	Class of Licence	Hours on Type	Hours Total
Pilot-In-Command	Commercial	300.0	5280

Approved for Release: Tuesday, February 20, 1996

It was reported that the aircraft was being used for endorsement training. On the second approach it was observed to land heavily and bounce back into the air. The aircraft then touched down again, nosewheel first, before the nosewheel collapsed and the aircraft slid to a stop.

It is probable that the pilot, who was undergoing endorsement training, misjudged the final part of the approach and allowed the aircraft to land heavily. His recovery action, following the bounce, was inappropriate as he allowed the aircraft to touch down nosewheel first. The instructor-pilot did not take over in time to prevent the bounced landing or the misjudged recovery.

A post-accident inspection indicated that whilst the nosewheel had folded back, following separation of the retraction/extension rod, neither of the main landing gear legs were locked down at the time of the final touchdown. The pilots reported that the gear lights were green, indicating that they were down and locked, prior to the first landing and that the landing gear warning horn had not sounded during the approach. The evidence indicates that the landing gear may have been inadvertently selected up during the attempted recovery from the bounced landing.