

THE COMMON LAW PROCESS OF TORTS

THE COMMON LAW PROCESS OF TORTS

SECOND EDITION

DAVID WEISSBRODT

*Regents Professor and Fredrikson & Byron Professor of Law
University of Minnesota Law School*

MARY PATRICIA BYRN

*Professor of Law
William Mitchell College of Law*

DONALD MARSHALL

*Professor and Law Alumni Distinguished Teacher
University of Minnesota Law School*



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

ISBN: 978-1-5310-2443-7 (Paperback)

ISBN: 978-0-32717-844-6 (eBook)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Weissbrodt, David S.

The common law process of torts / David Weissbrodt, Mary Patricia Byrn, Donald Marshall. -- 2nd ed.

p. cm

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-5310-2443-7

1. Torts--United States. I. Byrn, Mary Patricia. II. Marshall, Donald, 1931- III. Title.

KF1250.W454 2012

346.7303--dc23

2012017524

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2012 David Weissbrodt and Mary Patricia Byrn

All Rights Reserved

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work.

Carolina Academic Press
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
(919) 489-7486
www.caplaws.com

Printed in the United States of America
2021 Printing

Professor Donald G. Marshall *(1931–2010)*

Professor Donald G. Marshall joined the University of Minnesota Law School faculty in 1967, taught for 38 years, retired in 2005, and passed away on May 28, 2010, at age 79 after a fall in his home in Edina, Minnesota.

Professor Marshall was an outstanding teacher as well as an expert on torts, evidence, corporations, and juvenile justice. He received the Law School's Best Teaching Award for Excellence seven times — more than any other law faculty member. Many of his former students say he was the best teacher ever to enter a classroom at the University of Minnesota Law School. In 1994 he was awarded the Law School's first Law Alumni Distinguished Teacher Award. Over the course of his 38 years of teaching at the Law School, Professor Marshall taught 17 different courses to more than 7,500 law students. Reflecting on those classes, Marshall said that a class “develops a life of its own — a spirit of inquiry, an ethic of civility and mutual respect, [and] a standard of professional behavior.”

Professor Marshall was known for his use of the Socratic dialogue as his method of teaching. His style was one of precision, rigorous analysis, and gracefulness. For him, the genuine Socratic dialogue was “based on respect for the promise of the students' minds and a determination to help them realize that promise by providing intellectual challenge.” He explained his teaching as an effort to prepare his students for the practice of law which should be intellectually based, humanistically motivated, and richly varied.

Professor Marshall earned his B.A. at Williams College and his law degree from Yale, where he was Note and Comment Editor of the *Yale Law Journal*. He clerked for Justice Hayden Proctor of the New Jersey Supreme Court. Before entering his teaching career at Minnesota, he practiced law for seven years as an associate and then partner of the Newark, New Jersey, firm of Lowenstein & Spicer. Donald Marshall was survived by three sons and four grandchildren.

Table of Contents

<i>Professor Donald G. Marshall (1931-2010)</i>	iii
<i>Contributions</i>	xiii

Chapter I INTRODUCTION 1

What is a Tort?	2
Why Study Torts?	3
How to Study Torts?	3

Chapter II CASE ANALYSIS 7

A Civil Action Described	8
Karl Llewellyn, This Case System: What to Do with the Cases	16
Arthur W. Murphy, An Analysis of Holding and Dictum	26

Chapter III THEORIES OF LIABILITY IN TORT 31

Case of the Thorns	32
Note — Background of the <i>Case of the Thorns</i>	33
<i>Weaver v. Ward</i>	34
Note — Negligence Then and Now	35
Note — Excuse and Justification	35
<i>Brown v. Kendall</i>	36
Note — The Early Background of Torts	40
<i>Ballew v. Aiello</i>	43
Note — The United States Tort Law System	45
Note — Remedies	45

Chapter IV INTENTIONAL TORTS 47

A. VOLUNTARY ACTS AND INTENT	48
<i>Garratt v. Dailey</i>	49
Note — <i>Garratt</i> on Remand	52
Note — Bench Trial vs. Jury Trial	53
Note — The Liability of Parents for the Torts of Their Children	53
Note — The Restatements and The American Law Institute	55
<i>Seigel v. Long</i>	57
<i>McGuire v. Almy</i>	58
<i>Alteiri v. Colasso</i>	61
Note — Transferred Intent	62
B. BATTERY	64
<i>Baldinger v. Banks</i>	64
Note — The New York State Court System	66
Note — Thin-Skulled Person (Eggshell Plaintiff)	67
<i>Wishnatsky v. Huey</i>	67
<i>Paul v. Holbrook</i>	70

Table of Contents

	<i>Cohen v. Smith</i>	72
	<i>Picard v. Barry Pontiac-Buick, Inc.</i>	74
C.	ASSAULT	77
	<i>Kramer v. Ricksmeier</i>	78
	<i>Cucinotti v. Ortmann</i>	79
	<i>Banks v. Shivers</i>	82
	<i>Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Hill</i>	85
	Note — Criminal Assault and Battery	87
D.	FALSE IMPRISONMENT	88
	<i>Green v. Donroe</i>	89
	<i>Whittaker v. Sanford</i>	90
	Note — Remittitur and Additur	92
	<i>National Bond & Investment Co. v. Whithorn</i>	93
	<i>Webber v. Froedtert Memorial Lutheran Hospital</i>	96
	<i>Parvi v. City of Kingston</i>	98
	<i>Scofield v. Critical Air Medicine, Inc.</i>	101
	<i>Schroeder v. Lufthansa German Airlines</i>	105
E.	INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF SEVERE EMOTIONAL DISTRESS	108
	<i>Bowden v. Spiegel, Inc.</i>	109
	<i>State Rubbish Collectors Association v. Siliznoff</i>	110
	<i>Kentucky Fried Chicken National Management Co. v. Weathersby</i>	114
	<i>Dornfeld v. Oberg</i>	119
	<i>Slocum v. Food Fair Stores of Florida</i>	122
	<i>Patterson v. Wu Family Corporation</i>	124
	<i>Harris v. Jones</i>	125
	Note — Federal Taxation of Tort Damage Awards	130
F.	OTHER INTENTIONAL TORTS	131
	Note — Torts on the Internet	133
	Note — International Tort Claims in the United States	135
	Note — Causation and Intentional Torts	137
G.	DEFENSES TO INTENTIONAL TORTS	138
1.	Consent	139
	<i>O'Brien v. Cunard S.S. Co., Ltd.</i>	139
	Note — Who was Mary O'Brien?	141
	<i>Mohr v. Williams</i>	141
	<i>De May v. Roberts</i>	145
	Note — Consent and Medical Battery	148
	Note — Additional Consent Issues	148
2.	Necessity — Public and Private	150
	<i>Surocco v. Geary</i>	150
	Note — The <i>Saltpetre Case</i>	152

Table of Contents

	<i>Wegner v. Milwaukee Mutual Insurance Co.</i>	152
	<i>Ploof v. Putnam</i>	156
	<i>Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co.</i>	158
	Note — The Government as Tort Suit Defendant	161
3.	Self-Defense	164
	<i>Maichle v. Jonovic</i>	164
	Note — Special Verdicts	167
	<i>Silas v. Bowen</i>	167
4.	Defense of Others	170
5.	Defense of Property	170
	<i>Katko v. Briney</i>	170
6.	Shopkeeper’s Privilege and Privilege to Recapture Chattels	174
	<i>Alvarado v. City of Dodge City</i>	174
	Note — False Imprisonment and False Arrest	177
	Note — Current Status of the “Shopkeeper’s Privilege”	178
	MINN. STAT. § 629.366 (1957)	178
	MINN. STAT. § 629.366 (1998)	178
7.	Discipline — By Parents and Other Authority Figures	180
	<i>Steber v. Norris</i>	181
	Note — The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights	185
8.	Other Defenses to Intentional Torts	186
	Note — Basic Principles Common to All Privileges	187
Chapter V NEGLIGENCE		191
A.	INTRODUCTION TO NEGLIGENCE	192
	<i>Lobert v. Pack</i>	192
	<i>Cadorette v. Sumner County Board of Education</i>	195
	Note — Duty and Breach, Judge and Jury	197
	<i>Adams v. Bullock</i>	198
	<i>Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. v. Krayenbuhl</i>	199
	<i>Kleinknecht v. Gettysburg College</i>	202
	Note — Injury Caused During Rescue	206
	<i>Lubitz v. Wells</i>	206
	Note — What Does “Inherently Dangerous” Mean?	207
B.	REPRISE: UNDERSTANDING NEGLIGENCE IN CONTEXT	207
	<i>United States v. Carroll Towing Co.</i>	208
	Note — The Calculus of Risk Applied (or Misapplied)	211
	Note — The Coase Theorem, an Economic Analysis of Torts	213
C.	DUTY TO USE REASONABLE CARE	215
1.	The Reasonably Prudent Person	215

Table of Contents

	<i>Vaughan v. Menlove</i>	216
	<i>Cordas v. Peerless Transportation Co.</i>	219
	Note — Emergency Situations and the Reasonable Person	220
	<i>Delair v. McAdoo</i>	221
	Note — Knowledge and the Reasonable Person of Ordinary Prudence	223
	Note — Superior Knowledge or other Mental Attributes	224
	<i>Breunig v. American Family Insurance Co.</i>	225
	<i>Gould v. American Family Mutual Insurance Co.</i>	228
	Note — Liability Insurance and Direct Action Statutes	232
	<i>Seattle Electric Co. v. Hovden</i>	233
	Note — Standards for Mental Illness and Severely Reduced Capacity to Perceive The Risk	235
	<i>Roberts v. State</i>	235
	<i>Neumann v. Shlansky</i>	239
	Note — <i>Hoyt v. Rosenberg</i>	242
	Note — <i>Dellwo v. Pearson</i>	242
	<i>Tucker v. Henniker</i>	244
2.	The Role of Custom in Establishing a Standard of Care	245
	<i>The T. J. Hooper</i>	246
	Note — Additional Evidence	248
	Note — RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS on Custom	249
	Note — Appeal of an Interlocutory Decree	249
	<i>Marolla v. American Family Mutual Insurance Company</i>	249
	<i>Osborn v. Irwin Memorial Blood Bank</i>	253
	Note — The <i>Daubert</i> Standard for Admissibility of Expert Testimony	257
	<i>Vergara v. Doan</i>	258
	Note — Use of the Local and National Standards	261
	<i>Helling v. Carey</i>	261
	Note — After <i>Helling</i>	265
	<i>Hook v. Rothstein</i>	267
	<i>Canterbury v. Spence</i>	271
	Note — Different Approaches Regarding the Failure to Disclose Material Risks of Medical Procedures	279
	Note — Consent Given by Family Members of the Patient	280
	Demonstrate Your Learning: <i>Smith v. Jones</i>	280
	Demonstrate Your Learning: <i>Swift v. Jackson</i>	283
	Note — Approval by the Food and Drug Administration	285
3.	The Role of Judges in Establishing a Standard of Care	285
	<i>Baltimore & Ohio R. Co. v. Goodman</i>	286

Table of Contents

	<i>Pokora v. Wabash Railway Co.</i>	287
	Note — The Role of the Jury in Negligence Cases	290
	Note — Aggravated Wrongdoing: “Willful” and “Wanton” Misconduct	290
4.	The Role of Statutes in Establishing a Standard of Care	291
	<i>Bob Godfrey Pontiac, Inc. v. Roloff</i>	292
	<i>Clinkscales v. Carver</i>	296
	<i>Dance v. Town of Southampton</i>	298
	<i>Ross v. Alexander</i>	301
	Note — The RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS on Statutes	303
	<i>Teply v. Lincoln</i>	304
	<i>Sipes v. Albertson’s Inc.</i>	307
	Note — Dram Shop Liability	309
	<i>Satterlee v. Orange Glenn School District of San Diego County</i> . . .	310
	Note — After <i>Satterlee</i>	321
	Note — Using Criminal Statutes as a Substitute for a Common Law Standard of Care	321
	Note — Other Uses of Statutes	322
	<i>Kemp v. Wisconsin Electric Power Co.</i>	323
	Demonstrate Your Learning: <i>Noll v. Dine</i>	326
D.	BREACH OF DUTY	330
1.	Proof of Negligence	331
	<i>Goddard v. Boston & Maine Railroad Co.</i>	331
	Note — Methods of Establishing Breach of Duty	331
	<i>Anjou v. Boston Elevated Railway Co.</i>	332
	Note — Procedural Result	333
	Note — Burden of Proof	333
2.	<i>Res Ipsa Loquitur</i>	336
	<i>Byrne v. Boadle</i>	337
	<i>Larson v. St. Francis Hotel</i>	338
	<i>Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno</i>	340
	Note — The “Exclusive Control” Requirement	344
	<i>Brannon v. Wood</i>	345
	Note — Specific vs. General Allegations of Negligence	351
	<i>Ybarra v. Spangard</i>	351
	Note — The Impact of <i>Ybarra</i>	356
	<i>Imig v. Beck</i>	357
	Demonstrate Your Learning: <i>Smith v. County Fair Association et al.</i>	361
	Demonstrate Your Learning: <i>Naylor v. Stansel & Pelker</i>	363
E.	CAUSE-IN-FACT	365

Table of Contents

1.	But-For Test	366
	<i>Rouleau v. Blotner</i>	366
2.	Substantial Factor Test	368
	<i>Basko v. Sterling Drug</i>	368
	Note — Causation Terminology	372
3.	Complex Causation	373
	<i>Summers v. Tice</i>	373
	Note — Multiple Sufficient Causal Sets in the RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS	376
	<i>Herskovits v. Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound</i>	377
	Note — Professional Malpractice	385
	<i>Sindell v. Abbott Laboratories</i>	386
	Note — <i>Sindell v. Abbot Laboratories</i> : An Ambiguity Resolved . . .	398
F.	PROXIMATE CAUSE	403
	<i>Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. v. Daniels</i>	404
1.	Unforeseeable Consequences	405
	<i>Marshall Durbin, Inc. v. Tew</i>	405
	<i>Christianson v. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co.</i>	407
	<i>Ryan v. New York Central Railroad Co.</i>	410
	<i>Sipes v. Albertson's Inc.</i>	412
	Note — The RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS and Proximate Cause	413
	<i>Benn v. Thomas, K-G, Ltd.</i>	413
	<i>Re Polemis and Furness, Withy & Co., Ltd.</i>	415
	<i>Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd. v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co., Ltd.</i>	418
	<i>Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd. v. The Miller Steamship Co. PTV.</i> . .	423
	Note — The Required Specificity of the Foreseeable Harm	426
	<i>Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.</i>	427
	John Noonan, Persons and Masks of the Law	436
	<i>Kinsman Transit Co. [No. 1]</i>	460
	<i>Kinsman Transit Co. [No. 2]</i>	468
	<i>Tennessee Trailways, Inc. v. Ervin</i>	471
2.	Intervening Causes	473
	<i>Derdarian et al. v. Felix Contracting Corp.</i>	474
	<i>Watson v. Kentucky & Indiana Bridge & R. Co.</i>	476
	<i>Marshall v. Nugent</i>	478
G.	LIMITATIONS ON DUTY	480
1.	No Duty to Act	481
	<i>Yania v. Bigan</i>	482

Table of Contents

a.	Exception: Creating Peril	484
	<i>Herr v. Booten</i>	485
	<i>Tubbs v. Argus</i>	487
b.	Exception: Undertaking Assistance	489
	<i>Ocotillo West Joint Venture v. Superior Court for the County of</i> <i>Maricopa</i>	489
c.	Exception: Existing Special Relationship	492
	<i>Applebaum v. Nemon</i>	492
	Note — Statutory Duty to Rescue	496
	Note — Federal Law on Emergency Rooms	496
	<i>Tarasoff v. The Regents of the University of California</i>	497
	Note — The Aftermath of <i>Tarasoff</i>	504
	Note — Disclosure of Communicable Diseases	505
	Note — Abolishing Duty: The Approach of the RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS	505
2.	Prenatal Injury	506
	<i>Dietrich v. Inhabitants of Northampton</i>	506
	<i>Bonbrest v. Kotz</i>	508
3.	Wrongful Life and Wrongful Birth	512
	<i>Berman v. Allan</i>	513
	Note — <i>Roe v. Wade</i>	520
	<i>Procanik v. Cillo</i>	520
	<i>Turpin v. Sortini</i>	526
	Note — Current Policy	535
4.	Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	536
	<i>Vance v. Vance</i>	537
	<i>Dillon v. Legg</i>	543
	<i>Thing v. La Chusa</i>	547
	Note — Current Status of Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	553
H.	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	554
1.	Contributory and Comparative Negligence	555
	<i>Butterfield v. Forrester</i>	555
	<i>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority v. Young</i>	556
	Note — The Traditional View of Contributory Negligence	560
	<i>Li v. Yellow Cab Company of California</i>	561
	Varieties of Comparative Negligence	567
	R.I. <i>Gen. Laws § 9-20-4</i>	567
	MINN. STAT. § 604.01 (As amended in 1978 and 1990)	567
	MINN. STAT. § 604.01 (As enacted in 1969)	568
	S.D. CODIFIED LAWS § 20-9-2	568

Table of Contents

	Note — Comparative Negligence Today	568
2.	Assumption of Risk	570
	<i>Johnson v. New, Inc.</i>	570
	Note — Express Assumption of Risk: Exculpatory Clauses	572
	<i>Murphy v. Steeplechase Amusement Co.</i>	573
	<i>Riverside Iron-works Co. v. Green</i>	574
	<i>Hillman v. Carlton Co.</i>	576
	<i>Boddie v. Scott</i>	578
	<i>McGrath v. American Cyanamid Co.</i>	580
	Note — Assumption of Risk: Implied	582
Chapter VI	STRICT LIABILITY	583
A.	RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR	584
	<i>Commerce Bank v. Youth Services of Mid-Illinois, Inc.</i>	585
	Note — Gratuitous Agents	589
	<i>Hinman v. Westinghouse Electric Co.</i>	590
	<i>Iandiorio v. Kriss & Senko Enterprises, Inc.</i>	594
	<i>Pyne v. Witmer</i>	599
	Note — Frolic and Detour	603
	<i>Partridge v. Harvey</i>	605
	Note — Imputed Contributory Negligence	607
	Note — The Non-Delegable Duty Doctrine	608
B.	ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES	609
	<i>Cahill v. Eastman</i>	609
	<i>Thigpen v. Skousen & Hise</i>	612
	<i>Splendorio v. Bilray Demolition Co., Inc.</i>	614
	Note — Terminology	618
	<i>Herman v. Welland Chemical, Ltd.</i>	618
	Note — Liability for Harm Caused by Animals	620
	Note — Products Liability	620
Chapter VII	ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE TORTS SYSTEM	623
	Note — Attorney Fees and Access to Representation	623
	Note — Tort Reform	626
	Note — Alternatives to Tort	628
	APPENDIX: SAMPLE EXAMS	633
	TABLE OF STATUTES	TS-1
	TABLE OF CASES	TC-1
	INDEX	I-1

Contributions

We thank Meg Daniel, Emiliya Gumin, Aleava Hager, Jordan Kolar, Christopher Leff, Jacob McKnite, Meghan Schwartz, and Robert Ronan Slater for their invaluable assistance in finding, editing, assembling, and (in some instances) writing most of the material reproduced here; Professors Laura Cooper and Daniel Burk for their helpful comments; and Professor Robert Morris for use of materials he gathered. Mary Rumsey and George Jackson provided very helpful bibliographical assistance.

We also wish to express our thanks to copyright holders for graciously permitting us to include excerpts from their works (in order of their presentation):

“III. This Case System: What to do with the Cases” at pages 16–26 is reprinted as updated from KARL LLEWELLYN, *BRAMBLE BUSH* 41–55 (1960) by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc. (www.oup.com).

“Murphy, An Analysis of Holding and Dictum” (1948) at pages 26–29 is reprinted from N. DOWLING, E. PATTERSON, R. POWELL & H. JONES, *MATERIALS FOR LEGAL METHOD* 153–57 (1952) with permission of Foundation Press, Inc. Copyright © 1952 Foundation Press. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission.

“The Passengers of *Palsgraf*,” JOHN T. NOONAN, *PERSONS AND MASKS OF THE LAW*. With a New Preface. Copyright © 2002 University of California, is reprinted at pages 436–60 with permission of University of California Press and the author.

FORMAT NOTES

The judicial opinions are reproduced here as they appear in the printed reporters with the following exceptions:

1. Material omitted by the editors of these materials is indicated by an ellipsis (. . .). When entire paragraphs are omitted, bold ellipses (. . .) are used to clearly signal the omission. Material omitted by the original authors of the opinions is indicated by three stars (* * *).

2. Alterations of words are indicated by brackets ([]).

3. All block quotations are double indented and appear without quotation marks.

4. Many citations to cases and secondary materials have been omitted. The notation [case or cases omitted] indicates that one or more case citations have been omitted. The notation [citation omitted] indicates that a citation to material other than a case has been omitted. The notation [citations omitted] indicates that citations to more than one secondary source or to a mixture of secondary sources and cases have been omitted.

5. Footnotes have been omitted without notation. Where footnotes are retained, brackets indicate that they have been renumbered.

6. In some instances the format of case citations within the opinions has been altered so that all case citations conform to the rules of *THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION* (Columbia Law Review Ass’n et al. eds., 19th ed. 2010). Brackets around case citations indicate alteration of the form of the citation only. Citations to secondary sources appear just as they do in the printed reporters and may not conform to Bluebook rules.

Contributions

CASE CITATION FORMAT

Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co., 248 N.Y. 339, 162 N.E. 99 (1928).

Here is a brief explanation of the standard case citation format:

Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co. — The names of the parties. For the initial trial, the plaintiff’s name always comes first. In some jurisdictions, the plaintiff’s name remains first throughout the appeals process. In other jurisdictions, the name of whichever party is appealing the prior decision comes first.

248 N.Y. 339 — This citation is to a state reporter (a series of books containing judicial opinions). “248” is the volume number. “N.Y.” is the abbreviation for “New York Reports,” the state reporter for New York. “339” is the page on which the case begins. Some states do not publish official reporters. Judicial decisions from those states appear in one of West’s regional reporters.

162 N.E. 99 — This citation is to a regional reporter. West Group publishes all reported state appellate cases in a series of seven regional reporters. “N.E.” is the abbreviation for the North East Reporter. The citation format is the same as that of the state reporters.

(1928) — The year in which the case was decided.