

TORT LAW AND PRACTICE  
FIFTH EDITION



# TORT LAW AND PRACTICE

---

*FIFTH EDITION*

**DOMINICK VETRI**

*Professor of Law  
University of Oregon Law School*

**LAWRENCE C. LEVINE**

*Professor of Law  
University of the Pacific  
McGeorge School of Law*

**JOAN E. VOGEL**

*Professor of Law  
Vermont Law School*

**IBRAHIM J. GASSAMA**

*Frank Nash Professor of Law  
University of Oregon Law School*



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2016  
Carolina Academic Press, LLC  
All Rights Reserved

LCCN:: 2016904555

ISBN: 978-1-6328-4938-0  
ISBN: 978-1-6328-4939-7 (Looseleaf)

Carolina Academic Press, LLC  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, NC 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.caplax.com](http://www.caplax.com)

Printed in the United States of America

# *Dedications*

---

Dedicated to the generations of students of torts who make the teaching of this subject such a joy!

---

**Dominick Vetri:** To my partner Doug DeWitt.

**Lawrence C. Levine:** To my friend and colleague Julie Davies; my past, present, and future students; and in loving memory of Jeff Poile and Gerald Levine.

**Joan E. Vogel:** In loving memory of my parents, Harry and Marion Vogel, and to my good friends, Hugh Scogin and Reed Loder.

**Ibrahim J. Gassama:** To my partner Marva Donna Solomon, my daughter Fatima Selene Gassama, and in loving memory of Lucille Solomon and Humu Fofanah.



# Introduction

---

[L]ogic, and history, and custom, and utility, and the accepted standards of right conduct, are the forces which singly or in combination shape the progress of the law.

— BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO, CHIEF JUDGE, NEW YORK COURT OF APPEALS

You are embarked on a noble and important journey — the study of law. We will be studying our system of law which is older than our nation’s 230 plus years. Ours is a legal system with roots in the British-American colonies, England, Normandy, Rome and beyond. To understand law, to think about law and to learn to use law requires the development of a range of skills. You will be learning, as law teachers are fond of saying, “to think like lawyers!” These important skills that turn political scientists, historians, nurses, engineers, school teachers, musicians, and philosophers into competent lawyers include: careful reading, active listening, comprehending relevancy, critical evaluation, developing understanding and a sense of caring about people, institutions, and the local, national and world communities. It also involves the ability to be sensitive to ethical concerns. Your college work and real life experience undoubtedly has given you a good start with many of these skills. You will develop them considerably more in your law study.

A strange thing about law study is that in most first year programs you do not study these important lawyering skills directly. Mostly, these skills are acquired and honed as an implicit part of your study of substantive law subjects like torts, contracts, criminal law and civil procedure. Importantly, American law schools typically do not teach law by having you read and memorize rules and principles from scholarly legal treatises. Instead, in most first year programs, students learn the law and gain an understanding of the legal system through the study of the materials that lawyers and judges use in their daily work — cases, statutes, and administrative regulations. Law teachers believe that this method is the most effective way to teach the law.

Studying law is admittedly no easy task. It will be unlike anything you have ever done before. It will require intense critical thinking and extensive time. It is, however, an adventure — a challenging and rewarding new experience that will bring you immense intellectual and personal satisfaction.

Torts is a challenging field of law because it deals with everyday human experience and tragedy. Tort law is all about contemporary society — the accidents we experience, the personal and family relationships we create, the technology we use, and the societal mores we continue to evolve and reformulate. Torts is not only relevant to injured victims and their lawyers, but is also vitally important to society as a whole, the business and corporate community, the health care industry, and professionals of all types. Tort law most definitely is not a stodgy, old compartment of the common law; it is a vital component of the living common law.

The study of torts includes diverse areas of wrongful conduct such as negligence, personal injury law for unintentional harm, intentional torts (e.g., assault and battery),

---

## *Introduction*

products liability, abnormally dangerous activities liability (e.g., blasting, aerial pesticide spraying), nuisance (e.g., air, water, and noise pollution), defamation (libel and slander), privacy invasion, fraud, misrepresentation, and intentional interference with contracts. Tort law study includes consideration of alternatives to the liability scheme, such as no-fault systems. Our study also includes legislative measures undertaken in recent years by Congress and many state legislatures. These legislative changes are usually referred to as “tort law reform.” Maximum recoveries (“caps”) on pain and suffering damages, shorter statutes of limitation, restrictions on medical malpractice actions, protection against frivolous lawsuits, restrictions on contingency fees, and prevailing party attorney fee awards are the areas receiving much legislative attention.

The casebook begins with an overview of the different culpability standards that can be used in tort cases: intent, recklessness, negligence, and strict liability. The chapter uses hypothetical variations on the now infamous McDonald’s hot coffee spill case to illustrate the spectrum of culpability. These opening materials help you to begin to formulate the goals and objectives of the legal system as they relate to providing compensation for physical and emotional harm from intentional misconduct and unintentional accidents. Some teachers begin with intentional torts, others with negligence law. There are excellent reasons for starting with each subject area; the book is designed to accommodate either approach.

Historically, intentional torts evolved first. An understanding of this subject area allows for the elements of topics such as assault and battery to be readily developed and understood. Negligence has become the predominant means of recovery for unintentional harm in American law today. Virtually all that is learned in our focus on negligence has direct benefit and application in studying the other areas of tort law, particularly products liability. In studying negligence, we investigate the fundamental objectives that our society seeks to achieve through this method of compensation for unintentional harm.

In studying torts, you will learn much about our legal system, and particularly about our common law system. Indeed, one of the reasons torts is considered a building block and required course in the first-year curriculum is that an understanding of the subject carries along with it an understanding of the common law legal system. You will become very familiar with the legal process in civil cases, the use of precedents, and the role of the courts.

In the earliest period of the evolution of the common law legal system in Britain, crime and tort were much the same in scope. The intentional torts of assault and battery and trespass to land were probably the first to develop. The law’s function in both instances was to satisfy a public and private need for vengeance, and to avoid citizens taking the law into their own hands. Deterrence of wrongful conduct also came to be seen as an important objective. Tort liability, in effect, was a legal device to dissuade a victim from seeking retaliation by offering him monetary compensation instead. The recognized torts in this evolutionary period were closely related to threats of public disorder, or what came to be known as breaches of the King’s peace.

During this early period (before 1800), life was mostly agrarian in nature and injury resulting from the conduct of strangers was primarily intentional. Life was tough and inordinately short. Concern over unintentional harm was not a primary interest. As industry, urban life, and transportation developed, unintended accidents became much more commonplace, and indirect injury occurred more frequently. The new risks posed by



---

## *Introduction*

the developing industrial economy confronted the courts with problems that could not be resolved readily by the existing tort law; torts before then were based primarily on notions of causation and whether or not the harm was direct.

The common law courts, on both sides of the Atlantic and in other parts of the world, proceeded to develop a new accident law to cope with the changing society. Finding the “right balance” between the competing concerns of compensating victims and not unduly impeding developing entrepreneurship and industrialization was an important part the development of torts law. In trying to find the right balance between these two concerns, the courts built upon the ancient concept of negligence. Your study will show that negligence law has not remained static since that early period. The negligence law of the twenty-first century is not the same as the negligence law of the nineteenth century. As society has changed, so has negligence law. We will examine whether the right balance has been struck for our time.

We will also study about accidents in American society. Accidents are an ever-present reality in the American scene. Importantly, we have made considerable progress in bringing down the accident rate, but there have been no miracles here. The total number of accidents involving serious injuries and death on U.S. highways, at work, in our homes, and in public venues remain at unacceptably high levels. As part of our study of tort law, we will inquire into the kinds of accidents that occur in America today and their costs, both human and financial. Studying accidents naturally leads to consideration of accident prevention. Logically, accident prevention is a much wiser course of action than merely coping with medical treatment of injuries after the fact. We will consider whether in the scheme of things, accident prevention is generally given a high enough priority to have a significant effect on the number of accidents that occur.

Accidents cause injuries and injuries involve costs. The costs include not only physical injury harm, the resulting medical and rehabilitative expenses, and the loss of employment earnings, but also resulting property damages and economic losses. Furthermore, they include the human costs in terms of pain and suffering, loss of work ability and self-esteem, death, and the emotional distress that arises from accidents. How do accident victims cope? How do they pay those costs? Health and disability insurance are major players in dealing with some of these costs. But for too large a segment of our population have not had access to health or disability insurance. With the recent passage of health care reform, more people without access to health insurance will have access to some form of health insurance in the future. We will have to examine whether the extension of health insurance coverage will lower the costs of accidents and injuries. As you will see, tort law interacts in complex ways with liability, health, and disability insurance. Liability insurance has grown alongside negligence law and has become its partner, some would say senior partner, in the modern era.

The administrative costs of the negligence system are excessively high, and include: judicial salaries, courtroom facilities, jury fees, court clerks, secretaries, bailiffs, security guards, clerical personnel, building use costs, furniture, computers, utilities, cleaning expenses, and more when looking at trial and appellate court operations. Then there are the attorneys’ fees, both plaintiffs’ and defendants’, that have to be factored into overall administrative costs. The costs of our current accident scheme require us to also consider the cost of liability insurance, which includes the expenses of selling and administering the insurance system through adjusters and supervisors. In addition, settlement and mediation

---

## *Introduction*

of accident claims have become increasingly important in recent years.

Tort law alone cannot be the only device to deter accidents in our society. Administrative safety regulations, criminal laws, private standard setting, public interest consumer and worker organization oversight, safety education, and publicity about safety concerns all are part of the effort to reduce the accident level, along with tort law. It will be appropriate to consider the proper mix of these efforts on accident deterrence. Tort liability and liability insurance are not the only means of compensation for injuries; private health and disability insurance, no-fault auto insurance, and public welfare are other important mechanisms for covering accident losses. Here, too, we need to be concerned about the proper blending of these resources.

Your study of torts will teach you much about the legal rules and policies underlying the accident system in the U.S. Importantly, it will also teach you about the common law legal system. This knowledge will be helpful in your other studies and in your law career years ahead. Welcome to torts.

# Bookguide

---

The questions one asks oneself begin, at last, to illuminate the world, and become one's key to the experience of others.

— JAMES BALDWIN, *NOBODY KNOWS MY NAME* (1961).

Studies of teaching show that engaged students learn better. Because reading materials and listening to lectures involve only a low level of engagement, almost all of your classes in law school involve discussion and interaction with the teacher and other students to raise the level of engagement, and thus, enhance the learning experience. This casebook uses several techniques to increase the level of engagement as well. One of the first things you will realize is that there are lots of cases and a relatively low level of narrative information about the law. We teach primarily from cases, and more recently, from statutes and administrative regulations because they are the raw materials that lawyers and judges use in their daily work. Acquaintance with these materials and how to reason from them are critical to legal training.

Also, there are a number of questions following each case. You may find these questions somewhat difficult at first, but they are worth your patience and effort. Typically, they are designed to increase your understanding of the case, the evolving legal rules, and the attributes or deficiencies in the reasoning. They often do not have definitive answers, and are intended to stimulate your development of analysis skills. Work through as many questions as you can by re-reading the relevant parts of the case and talking over the questions with your colleagues. Sometimes in coming back to a question, you will later find that you have begun to work out an answer. The class discussion may often be patterned on, or relate in some way, to the questions. The questions are designed to engage you at a deeper level with what you have read, to force you to go beyond memorizing basic legal concepts, and to help you think about the materials.

One of the features of the book in the negligence area is its introduction to the five elements of a negligence claim including damages and the concept of defenses in an overview of negligence law at the outset. The basics are set out early in your learning process; you get to see the larger picture and where we will be headed for a good part of the semester. The next several chapters take each element in turn, and focus on the more complex aspects of the element. The questions, materials, and problems following the cases frequently remind you to maintain the overall perspective of the five necessary elements to make out a negligence claim, as well as possible defenses. This book emphasizes sequential learning. Gradually, you will increase your sophistication and understanding of each element as we proceed through the chapters. As you build your skill and understanding, the more challenging portions of the subject will fall into place.

Our study of tort law will give you the basic grounding in understanding our common law system and the use of precedents. The common law, in contrast to authoritative texts such as constitutions and statutes, is that part of the law that is established by courts. Common law courts typically invoke precedents to justify their conclusions. They also often explain why they have followed certain earlier decisions and not others. The common law is knowable only by reading past cases and deducing legal principles from those cases. It is different from statutory and constitutional law in that common law is self-generating, i.e., past decisions are used to justify present decisions, and present decisions are references for future cases. At the same time that the common law relies on past decisions to decide many of today's cases, however, it must be open to change in light of an evolving society. A system of law that ties itself only to the past would soon be useless in the modern world. Thus, working with precedents, you will learn, is far more sophisticated and complex than just trying to determine what the rule was in a case decided 50 years ago. Our earliest concerns will be in

---

## *Bookguide*

determining what is precedent, why courts should follow it, logical extensions of precedent, developing analogies from precedent, and the flexibility courts have in dealing with precedents that are out of date, discriminatory, unbalanced, unfair, or simply wrong. Learning to identify the “holdings” of cases is the first step in working with precedents, since holdings are binding as precedent on future courts. A Case Briefing Guide is provided at the end of this Bookguide to get you started in working with cases.

The materials from the outset help you to integrate civil procedure into tort practice. The two are inextricably intertwined. You will also find that our study of torts complements your study of criminal law, contracts, and property in many areas. Our work with statutes will also prepare you well for administrative law and the heavily statutory-based courses, such as environmental law, the Uniform Commercial Code, and tax law. Traditionally, areas like torts, contracts, and property were predominantly common law. Statutes, however, have come to play an increasingly important role in these three subject areas. We will focus on the relationship of courts and legislatures in our system. The roles of judges and lawyers also loom large in the text.

A major feature of this book is its use of problems. Problems are placed strategically throughout the materials to engage you and to reinforce learning. Learning how to problem solve is quite important, because essentially, that is what lawyering is all about. Problem solving takes you beyond learning rules. These problems help you learn application, synthesis, and the integration of legal doctrines and skills into practice. Educators know that this is the most effective way to learn. Problem analysis raises the level of engagement considerably.

The problems typically ask you to assume the role of a lawyer. The materials also challenge the system and legal structures and call upon you to consider public policy choices. Law exams are typically based on problems that are similar to the ones you will encounter throughout the text. Learning how to analyze the problems and write organized, coherent answers will prepare you for not only torts exams, but those in all your courses. You are encouraged to write out your answers to problems and to discuss the problems and your answers with your colleagues.

Ethical concerns and ethics problems are also integrated throughout the materials. Ethical integrity and propriety are an important part of legal education and your law career ahead. Such an important area cannot be left to a single course on Professional Responsibility. Ethics issues are best understood in the contexts and circumstances in which they arise. You will confront ethical decision-making in personal injury cases, such as the problem of the lying client, conflicts of interest, honesty to the court, the zealous advocacy role of the lawyer, and others.

The cases, problems, hypotheticals, and questions in the book also present the opportunity to learn about issues related to people of color, ethnic groups, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation. As lawyers, you will handle cases for people from a wide variety of backgrounds, and you must be prepared to conscientiously, sensitively, and competently represent clients from the diverse American community. As a small starting point, the names of the parties in the problems throughout the book reflect the multi-cultural nature of American society. The factual settings of the problems also, on occasion, provide information and raise issues that are of concern to diverse communities. In short, the book is intended to reflect contemporary America and to prepare you to practice law in this milieu.

Our study of tort law will not focus on the law of any particular state. Much of tort law, as we shall see, is either the same or quite similar among many states. The differences and variations among states often are opportunities to learn about alternative solutions and about law reform possibilities. We will be learning general principles, alternatives, exceptions, and the role of public policy in court decisions on torts. Since law continues to evolve, comparing alternatives and evaluating exceptions is an important role for lawyers. Many of the cases in the book were decided after 1990, and a number within the last five years. The classic torts cases, however, have been included. A sense of legal history is provided. Tort law is an evolving social phenomenon and the book aims to be contemporary.

---

## Bookguide

The names of the cases usually reflect only the first party on each side of the case, e.g., *Rudolph v. Arizona B.A.S.S. Federation*, the first case in Chapter 2. There were several parties on each side of this case, but the practice by lawyers in citing cases is to use only the first party's name on each side. Most courts today place the plaintiff's name to the left of the versus line, and the defendant's name to the right. An earlier practice, reflected in older cases, placed the appellant's name (the appealing party whether plaintiff or defendant) to the left of the versus line, and the respondent's name after.

The citation of a case follows the case name, e.g., the *Rudolph* case is followed by 182 Ariz. 622, 898 P.2d 1000 (Ct. App. 1995). The first cite is usually to the volumes of official reports, here Arizona Reports, and the second cite is usually to a private commercial reporter system — West Publishing Co., here the Pacific Second series. The numbers 182 and 898 in the preceding cite are to the respective volume numbers of the reports, and the numbers 622 and 1000 are the page numbers in those reports where the case begins. Thus, you will find the *Rudolph* case in volume 182 of the official Arizona reports at page 623, and the same case also appears in volume 898 of West Publishing's second series of Pacific Reports at page 1000. The year the case was decided is placed in parenthesis after the citation. If the highest court of the state wrote the opinion, only the date is in the parenthesis. If a lower court wrote the opinion, an abbreviation of that court's name appears in the citation. In the *Rudolph* case, the Arizona Court of Appeals, an intermediate court lower in rank than the Arizona Supreme Court decided the case. You will soon become an old hand at working with these citations.

The names of the attorneys who wrote the briefs and argued the cases on appeal can also be found by looking up the cases in the reports. Customarily in casebooks, to save space, the attorneys' names are omitted. This is a disservice to the hardworking attorneys because their work is usually the basis of the opinions of the courts. Much of the responsibility for the quality of opinions belongs to the attorneys. The judge that is the author of the opinion usually should not get all of the credit if it is a good opinion, or all of the blame, if the opinion leaves much to be desired. The *Rudolph v. Arizona B.A.S.S. Federation* case in Chapter 2 includes the names of the attorneys, to remind you of their necessary role in the process. A fundamental dimension of this book is to orient the student towards the lawyers' work in presenting, defending, and appealing personal injury cases.

We have tried to balance the use of pronouns throughout the book. Older cases and articles almost invariably use male references. The note cases that sometimes follow lead cases are primarily in the language of the courts, but occasionally we have rephrased some of the content. In such note cases, the language of the court always appears in quotes. The cartoons are used to lighten up what often is rather tragic material. When you think about it, this is a book that, for the most part, deals with injuries, death, and other kinds of harm. Although keeping a certain emotional distance from the problems confronted is essential to doing competent work, total disengagement is not acceptable either. Finding the right balance is one of the criteria that defines a professional.

The book makes frequent reference to a number of excellent texts and treatises, available in your law library, in a short hand fashion as follows: DAN B. DOBBS, PAUL T. HAYDEN & ELLEN BUBLICK, *THE LAW OF TORTS* (2015 Westlaw), usually cited as "DOBBS" followed by a section number; JOHN L. DIAMOND, LAWRENCE C. LEVINE & ANITA BERNSTEIN, *UNDERSTANDING TORTS* (5th ed. 2013), abbreviated as "UNDERSTANDING TORTS"; and JOSEPH W. GLANNON, *THE LAW OF TORTS: EXAMPLES & EXPLANATIONS* (4th ed. 2010) is abbreviated as "GLANNON."

Class preparation requires that you brief the cases that you read. Briefing is an art that lawyers acquire from experience. Teachers often have special ways they like to have cases briefed, so there is no uniform pattern. The following suggestions on briefing, however, are offered as general guidelines as you begin your classes. We are indebted to Professors Paul J. Mishkin and Clarence Morris and their impressive book, *ON LAW IN COURTS* at 11 (1965), for their considerable insights about briefing cases.

## **Case Briefing Guidelines**

(1). **Facts.** Identify the critical facts of the case, striking off those facts that are not relevant to the decision of the court.

(2). **Procedural Background.** Determine the particular ruling or rulings of the trial judge that became crucial on appeal. Was it the grant or denial of a directed verdict motion, a summary judgment motion, a motion on the pleadings, a motion on the judgment, etc. Another way of looking at this is to ask, who won below and what procedural device did the winner invoke? Isolating the procedural ruling helps to identify the issue on appeal in terms of law and fact questions.

(3). **Issues.** Identify the precise legal issues on appeal. Determine the legal questions that were necessary for the court to resolve. A ruling on an issue that is not necessary to the resolution of the case is referred to as dictum. Rulings on relevant issues are referred to as holdings. Holdings have precedential value for future cases. Dicta has whatever persuasive weight future courts choose to give it.

(4). **Holding.** State the holding of the case as a rule of law. Often, there are several holdings. You will learn that a holding can be stated broadly or narrowly in terms of their effect on future cases. Lawyers, on behalf of their clients, often use this flexibility in describing holdings when arguing the merit of a precedent in future cases. You should attempt to both frame your holdings broadly and narrowly in each case to help you develop the skill. Consider the rules the plaintiff and defendant were respectively seeking to have adopted by the court. Determine whether the court chose one party's suggestions or developed its own legal rule. We are looking for the guidance the decision provides for future cases. Procedural details and irrelevant facts should be eliminated from your holding statements. Determine if the case expands existing precedents, modifies them, overrules them, or possibly reduces the reach of the precedents.

(5). **Sources of Authority.** Identify the sources of authority relied on by the court. Determine if the court relies on in-state precedents, out-of-state decisions, statutes, administrative regulations, treatises, law review articles, etc. Analyze whether the sources of authority are clearly on point, are based on strong principles, are controlling, and are persuasive. Determine if the court relied on public policy considerations. Policy considerations such as accident prevention, economic concerns, compensation, administrative workability of rules, fairness and justice are often appropriate factors in the resolution of torts cases.

(6). **Evaluate the Reasoning.** Consider whether the reasoning of the court is sound, effective, and persuasive. Determine if the court overlooked or under valued anything. Consider how you would have decided the case.

(7). **Concurring and Dissenting Opinions.** Determine why the judge believed it necessary to write a separate opinion. These separate opinions may provide insights about what the majority did. Compare the reasoning and the use of precedents of the differing opinions.

We trust that as you work your way through this book and develop competent lawyering skills, you will find your study of tort law as intellectually stimulating and interesting as many generations of law students before you have found it. Good venturing in tort law!

# Permissions

---

We are very grateful to the following authors, artists, agents, and publishers for granting permission to use their copyrighted works.

## Articles, Books & Newspapers

American Law Institute.

RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW (SECOND) TORTS: 46 (comment d), 220, 222A, 288A (comment excerpts), 288C, 298 (comment excerpts), 314, 328D, 339, 402A (comment excerpts), 559, 652C, 652E, 821B, 821C, 826(a) and (b) & 829A. Copyright © 1965 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

RESTATEMENT (THIRD) TORTS: LIABILITY FOR PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL HARM sections 1, 3 (comment excerpts), 4, 6, cmt f, 7(a) & (b), comment j, 8, 10, 14, 17, 25 (comment excerpts), 28, 29 (comment excerpts), instruction 1, 45 (comment excerpts), 46, comment g. Copyright © 2010 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW (THIRD) UNFAIR COMPETITION: sections 46 & 47. Copyright © 1995 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW (THIRD) TORTS: PRODUCTS LIABILITY: sections 1, 2 (comment excerpts), 3, 4, 10. Copyright © 1998 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

Anderson, David A., *Reputation, Compensation, and Proof*, 25 WM. & MARY L. REV. 747, 764-66 (1984).

Berger, Margaret, *Eliminating General Causation: Notes Towards a New Theory of Justice & Toxic Torts*, 97 COLUM. L. REV. 2177 (1997). Copyright © 1997 Directors of the Columbia Law Review Association, Inc.; Margaret A. Berger.

Berger, Margaret A. & Twerski, Aaron D., *From the Wrong End of the Telescope: A Response to Professor David Bernstein*, 104 MICH. L. REV. 1983 (2006). Copyright 2006 Michigan Law Review Association; Margaret A. Berger; Aaron D. Twerski.

Bhomik, Rachana, Lowy, Jonathan E. & Rostron, Allen, *A Sense of Duty*, 4 J. HEALTH CARE L. & POLICY 42 (2000).

Campbell, Kevin, Nahrstadt, Bradley, *Refuting Damages in a Personal Injury Case*, 24 BRIEF 9 (1995), American Bar Association. Revised from C. Barry Montgomery, *Keeping Damages Fair and Reasonable*, Ch. 7 in MASTERS OF TRIAL PRACTICE, Janine Warsaw ed. (1989), copyright © John Wiley & Sons, Publisher.

Chlapowski, Francis, *The Constitutional Protection of Informational Privacy*, Volume 71:1 B. U. L. REV. (1991) 133-60. Reprinted with permission. Copyright © 1991 Trustees of Boston University. Forum of original publication.

Culhane, John G., “*A Clanging Silence*”: *Same-Sex Couples and Tort Law*, 89 KY. L.J. 911 (2000-2001).

Grady, Mark F., *Untaken Precautions*, 18 J. LEGAL STUD. 139 (1989). Copyright © The University of Chicago.

Handsley, Elizabeth, *Mental Injury Occasioned by Harm to Another: A Feminist Critique*, 14 LAW & INEQ. 391 (1996).

HOLMES, OLIVER WENDELL, THE COMMON LAW (1881), Little, Brown and Co.

Kelner, Joseph, *The Catastrophic Case*, 27 TRIAL 34 (1995). Reprinted with permission of TRIAL (1995). Copyright © The Association of Trial Lawyers of America.



---

## Permissions

Koskoff, Yale D., *The Nature of Pain & Suffering*, 13 TRIAL 21–24 (1977). Reprinted with permission of TRIAL (1977). Copyright © The Association of Trial Lawyers of America.

Lawrence, III, Charles R., *If He Hollers Let Him Go: Regulating Racist Speech on Campus*, WORDS THAT WOUND 53 (1993).

THE LONDON INDEPENDENT, “Spleenless in Seattle,” Dec. 6, 1994.

Malone, Wex S., *Ruminations on Cause in Fact*, 9 STAN. L. REV. 60 (1956). Copyright © 1956 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.

McClurg, Andrew J., *Poetry in Commotion: Katko v. Briney and the Bards of First-Year Torts*, 74 OR. L. REV. 823 (1995). Poem “*Katko v. Briney*” by Gary Austin. Reprinted by Permission. Copyright © 1995 by University of Oregon.

MORRIS, CLARENCE & C. ROBERT, MORRIS ON TORTS 155–58, 163–66 (2d ed. 1980). Reprinted by permission from MORRIS ON TORTS (2d ed. 1980). Copyright © Foundation Press, Westbury, New York.

New York Times, *Bomb Blast Injures 13 in Station Crowd*, Aug. 25, 1924. Copyright © 1924 by the New York Times Co. Reprinted by permission.

Schlinsog, Jr., Albert C., *The Suicidal Decedent: Culpable Wrongdoer or Wrongfully Deceased?* 24 J. MARSHALL L. REV. 463, 474 (1991).

Uniform Comparative Fault Act 1977, § 2, comment. Reprinted by Permission. Copyright 2008 by The National Conference on Uniform State Laws

West Publishing Co., several charts and graphs from LAWRENCE C. LEVINE, SUM & SUBSTANCE QUICK REVIEW: TORTS (3d ed. 2000).

### Photographs & Artwork

Cardozo, Benjamin, Nathan, Reproduced from the collection of the Library of Congress, LC-USZ62-75144.

Hand, Learned, Reproduced from the collection of the Library of Congress, LC-USZ62-98139.

Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Reproduced from the collection of the Library of Congress, copyright CLINEDINST, LC-USZ62-9406.

Home icon made by Freepik from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com)

Auto Accident icon by Freepik from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com)

Crosswalk icon by Freepik from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com)

Cyclist icon made by Scott de Jonge from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com)

### Cartoons

CALVIN & HOBBS. © 1990, 1995 Watterson. Reprinted with permission of Universal Uclick. All rights reserved.

Linda Ziskin © 1998, 2002. All rights reserved. Copyright © 2003. All rights reserved.

Colette T Katz © 2003. Copyright © 1998, 2002. All rights reserved.



# Acknowledgments

---

[A] person does not cease to be a person when she puts on her black robe, any more than a judge who acknowledges her humanity thereby ceases to be a judge. The best judges are those who can be both judge and human at once.

— Shirley S. Abrahamson, Chief Justice, Wisconsin Supreme Court

## **Dominick Vetri**

I would like to thank three faculty colleagues who were very helpful in reviewing portions of the book and offering cogent suggestions: Caroline Forell, Erik Girvan, and Ofer Rabon.

Debby Warren brought her considerable faculty support talents and competence to the work on this fourth edition.

The many torts students I have had the pleasure of teaching over the years and those who used this book in its various incarnations enabled I am deeply indebted to my extremely competent and diligent research assistants for their work and insights on the four editions of the casebook.

Linda Ziskin, a torts student and now a successful attorney, contributed considerable legal insights, and wit, satire, and artistic talent with her wonderfully creative cartoons. She also was extremely helpful in developing and coordinating the numerous permissions that were essential for the first edition of the book. Sean Mangan also created a wonderful cartoon strip to illustrate the McDonald's hypothetical problems in Chapter 1. Colette T Katz has produced a creative cartoon for Chapter 3.

Debby helped me to develop many of the ideas for the casebook. I heartily thank them for their understanding, and for the numerous ideas and suggestions they made. I am deeply indebted to my extremely competent and diligent research assistants on the editions of this casebook: Laura Sadowski, Christopher Walther, Shannon Green, Ben Tiller, Michael Stephenson, Natalie Duke, Steffanie Foster, Tiffany Keb, John Wilson, Anne Abbott, Heather Cavanaugh, Christy Cox, Arne Cherkoss, Monica Wells, Ky Fullerton, Louis Bubala, Charlotte Waldo, Jeff Mitchell, Robert Muraski, Sam Taylor, Tristyne Edmon, Anthony Wilson, Chad Standifer, Linda Ziskin, Tamara Brickman, M. H. Choo, Lynne Rennick, Kirsten Jepsen, Gene Shapiro, Phil Horne, Kyle Wuepper, Inger Brockman, Tracy Trunnell, Joel Parker, Mark Ditton,, Susie Mason, Patrick Aquino, and Merlyn Adams Their thorough legal research, ideas, and editing make the book a much better work product, and working with each of them made the development of the book a pleasure. I wish each of them well, happiness, and great success in their lives and career years ahead.

Thanks also to my partner Doug DeWitt, for his inordinate patience with me as the book grew and developed and now has become a fifth edition.

## **Lawrence C. Levine**

My thanks to the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law for providing me a sabbatical to work on this project. Also thanks to my colleague, Julie Davies, for her

---

## *Acknowledgments*

helpful input along the way. Indeed, my dedication to this book recognizes Julie's enormous contributions to me not just on this book, but as a Torts professor in general. I also am extremely grateful to Dom Vetri for inviting me to participate on the casebook. It took great generosity and confidence.

I have benefited from the work of too many Torts teacher-scholars to name. I do wish to thank Jane Aiken, Jody Armour, and Jean Love specifically for providing thoughts on ways to make this casebook more inclusive.

I am most grateful to my research assistants Shaun Edwards (McGeorge '12), Max Hellman (McGeorge '11), John Marchione (NYLS '11), Jo Mitchell (McGeorge '12), Cheri Reynolds (Lewis & Clark '12), and Therese Vradenburg (McGeorge '12) for their invaluable help with this edition. I remain indebted to my research assistants Poopak Banky (NYLS '07), Kurt Havens (NYLS '07), Matt Hooper (McGeorge '08), Morgan Kunz (NYLS '06), Lara Wallman (McGeorge '06), Margaret Broussard (McGeorge '02), Marianne Water-stradt (McGeorge '03), Amelia Sanders (McGeorge '02), and Michael Grosso (NYLS '03), who with tenacity and good humor contributed mightily to earlier editions. Also, I am beholden to R.K. Van Every for her assistance with this edition and to Denai Burbank and Paul Fuller for their help on prior editions.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude to the many students who make each class a new adventure.

### **Joan E. Vogel**

I wish to acknowledge a special debt of gratitude that I owe to Lucinda Finley who recommended that I join this casebook in its Second Edition. I also want to thank all my research assistants and faculty secretaries for their invaluable assistance on the second and third editions of this casebook. I am grateful to Elijah LaChance and my faculty secretary Jennifer Lawrence, for the wonderful assistance they provided on the Fifth Edition. I am particularly grateful to Dean of Vermont Law School, Marc Mihaly and Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Jackie Gardina, for the support I received for this project. I am also grateful to Lucinda Finely, Richard Delgado, Leslie Bender, Taunya Banks, Jean Love, Phoebe Haddon, Martha Chamallas, and Okianer C. Dark for helping me think about ways to integrate race, gender, sexual orientation, sexual identity, and class into the teaching of tort law. As always, I want to express my thanks to all my torts students for their invaluable feedback on the casebook.

### **Ibrahim J. Gassama**

My deepest gratitude goes to Dom Vetri, Joan Vogel, and Lawrence Levine for the opportunity to participate in this outstanding labor of love. I am honored to be in their company. To the many students in my torts classes over the years who have never allowed me to leave a class uninspired, I want to say thank you. My thanks also go to Professors Hope Lewis, Leslie Harris, Michelle McKinley, and Keith Aoki, for their persistent encouragement and support over the years. My contribution to this text would have suffered greatly without the insights and commitment of my research assistants over the years, including Aaron Crockett, Kyle Ingram, Marissa Martinez, Colin R. Saint-Evens, and Courtney Leigh Pickus. I am indebted to my faculty support colleagues Debby Warren and Jennifer Kepka who provided exceptional editorial assistance.

# Summary of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION TO TORT LAW</b>	<b>1</b>
§ 1.01	INTRODUCTION	2
§ 1.02	ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES	3
§ 1.03	A BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF TORT LAW	7
§ 1.04	THE CULPABILITY SPECTRUM IN TORT LAW	8
§ 1.05	THE FUNCTIONS AND GOALS OF NEGLIGENCE LAW	11
§ 1.06	HOT COFFEE AND CULPABILITY PROBLEMS	13
§ 1.07	OVERVIEW OF PERSONAL INJURY DAMAGES	27
§ 1.08	THE TORT LAW LITIGATION PROCESS	30
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>NEGLIGENCE LAW: BREACH OF DUTY</b>	<b>47</b>
§ 2.01	OVERVIEW OF NEGLIGENCE LAW	48
§ 2.02	ANALYSIS OF THE ELEMENTS OF A NEGLIGENCE CASE	52
§ 2.03	THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD	65
§ 2.04	THE REASONABLE PERSON	66
§ 2.05	DEVELOPING THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD	89
§ 2.06	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD	116
§ 2.07	PROOF OF NEGLIGENCE	142
§ 2.08	THE STANDARD OF CARE IN PROFESSIONAL MALPRACTICE	161
§ 2.09	PUTTING BREACH OF DUTY ANALYSIS TOGETHER	184
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>DUTY</b>	<b>189</b>
§ 3.01	GENERAL DUTY PRINCIPLE OF REASONABLE CARE	190
§ 3.02	LIMITED DUTY RULES	205
§ 3.03	PUTTING DUTY ANALYSIS TOGETHER	351
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>CAUSATION</b>	<b>359</b>
§ 4.01	THE CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF CAUSATION	360
§ 4.02	LOSS OF A CHANCE OF RECOVERY	400
§ 4.03	USING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EVIDENCE TO PROVE CAUSATION	411
§ 4.04	PROVING WHO CAUSED THE HARM	428
§ 4.05	PUTTING CAUSATION TOGETHER	444
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>SCOPE OF LIABILITY (PROXIMATE CAUSE)</b>	<b>447</b>
§ 5.01	THE CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF SCOPE OF LIABILITY	448
§ 5.02	APPLICATIONS OF THE FORESIGHT RULE	452

---

## *Summary of Contents*

§ 5.03	EXCEPTIONS TO THE FORESIGHT RULE . . . . .	486
§ 5.04	FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING SCOPE OF LIABILITY . . . . .	499
§ 5.05	PUTTING SCOPE OF LIABILITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	507
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>DAMAGES . . . . .</b>	<b>511</b>
§ 6.01	PERSONAL INJURY DAMAGES . . . . .	512
§ 6.02	PAIN, SUFFERING, AND EMOTIONAL DISTRESS . . . . .	529
§ 6.03	LOSS OF ENJOYMENT OF LIFE DAMAGES . . . . .	533
§ 6.04	WRONGFUL DEATH . . . . .	542
§ 6.05	RACIAL, GENDER, COHABITATION, & CLASS FAIRNESS IN TORT . . . . .	551
§ 6.06	PUNITIVE DAMAGES . . . . .	589
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>DEFENSES AND IMMUNITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>605</b>
§ 7.01	CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE . . . . .	606
§ 7.02	COMPARATIVE FAULT . . . . .	607
§ 7.03	ASSUMPTION OF RISK . . . . .	623
§ 7.04	ANALYSIS UNDER DIFFERENT COMPARATIVE FAULT SYSTEMS . . . . .	646
§ 7.05	STATUTES OF LIMITATION . . . . .	652
§ 7.06	CHARITABLE IMMUNITY . . . . .	666
§ 7.07	SPOUSAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	667
§ 7.08	PARENTAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	669
§ 7.09	GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	675
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>INTENTIONAL TORTS . . . . .</b>	<b>685</b>
§ 8.01	OVERVIEW OF INTENTIONAL TORTS . . . . .	685
§ 8.02	ASSAULT, BATTERY, AND INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS . . . . .	686
§ 8.03	THE MEANING OF INTENT . . . . .	695
§ 8.04	SHORT PROBLEMS ON BATTERY AND ASSAULT . . . . .	711
§ 8.05	INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS IN DISCRIMINATION CASES . . . . .	715
§ 8.06	SHORT PRACTICE PROBLEMS ON INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS . . . . .	737
§ 8.07	FALSE IMPRISONMENT . . . . .	740
§ 8.08	TRESPASS TO CHATTELS AND CONVERSION . . . . .	749
§ 8.09	DEFENSES AND PRIVILEGES . . . . .	757
§ 8.10	PUTTING INTENTIONAL TORT ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	788

---

## *Summary of Contents*

<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>TRESPASS TO LAND, NUISANCE, AND ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>797</b>
§ 9.01	TRESPASS TO LAND .....	798
§ 9.02	NUISANCE .....	802
§ 9.03	ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES .....	832
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>PRODUCTS LIABILITY</b> .....	<b>849</b>
§ 10.01	THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY .....	850
§ 10.02	THE PRIMA FACIE CASE OF STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY ....	865
§ 10.03	DEFENSES .....	955
§ 10.04	PUTTING PRODUCTS LIABILITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER .....	961
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>DEFAMATION LAW</b> .....	<b>965</b>
§ 11.01	OVERVIEW OF COMMON LAW DEFAMATION AND DEFENSES .	966
§ 11.02	THE “CONSTITUTIONALIZATION” OF DEFAMATION LAW: FIRST AMENDMENT PRIVILEGES .....	993
§ 11.03	CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES: PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND PUBLIC FIGURES .....	996
§ 11.04	CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES: PRIVATE PERSONS .....	1015
§ 11.05	DETERMINING STATUS .....	1038
§ 11.06	OPINION REVISITED .....	1047
§ 11.07	PUTTING DEFAMATION ANALYSIS TOGETHER .....	1049
<b>Chapter 12</b>	<b>PRIVACY</b> .....	<b>1055</b>
§ 12.01	INTRODUCTION TO PRIVACY .....	1056
§ 12.02	INTRUSION .....	1067
§ 12.03	PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE FACTS .....	1086
§ 12.04	FALSE LIGHT INVASION OF PRIVACY .....	1102
§ 12.05	APPROPRIATION .....	1115
§ 12.06	RIGHT OF PUBLICITY .....	1121
§ 12.07	PUTTING PRIVACY AND PUBLICITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER ..	1131



# Table of Contents

<i>Dedications</i> .....	iii
<i>Introduction</i> .....	v
<i>Bookguide</i> .....	ix
<i>Permissions</i> .....	xiii
<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	xv
<i>Summary of Contents</i> .....	xvii

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION TO TORT LAW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<hr/>		
PART I	.....	2
§ 1.01	INTRODUCTION .....	2
§ 1.02	ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES .....	3
§ 1.03	A BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF TORT LAW .....	7
§ 1.04	THE CULPABILITY SPECTRUM IN TORT LAW .....	8
[A]	Intended Harm: Intentional Torts .....	9
[B]	Unintended Harm .....	10
[1]	Negligence .....	10
[2]	Recklessness .....	10
[3]	Strict Liability (No Fault Liability) .....	11
§ 1.05	THE FUNCTIONS AND GOALS OF NEGLIGENCE LAW .....	11
[A]	Deterrence and Accident Prevention .....	12
[B]	Compensation .....	12
[C]	Avoidance of Undue Burdens on Economic Activities .....	12
[D]	Effective and Efficient Legal Process .....	13
[E]	Fairness .....	13
§ 1.06	HOT COFFEE AND CULPABILITY PROBLEMS .....	13
[A]	The Willful Misconduct Problem .....	14
[B]	The Actual McDonald’s Negligence (and Recklessness) Case .....	16
[C]	The No Fault (Strict Liability) Problem .....	23
[1]	Strict Liability .....	24
[2]	Compensation Systems .....	26
§ 1.07	OVERVIEW OF PERSONAL INJURY DAMAGES .....	27
PART II	.....	30
§ 1.08	THE TORT LAW LITIGATION PROCESS .....	30
[A]	Lawyer Consultation .....	31
[1]	Interview .....	31
[2]	Research .....	32
[3]	Preliminary Investigation .....	32
[4]	The Defense Lawyer’s Perspective .....	32
[B]	Pleadings .....	33

---

## Table of Contents

[1]	Complaint . . . . .	33
[2]	Answer and Counterclaims . . . . .	33
[3]	Motions . . . . .	33
[C]	Pre-Trial Procedure . . . . .	34
[1]	Investigation . . . . .	34
[2]	Discovery . . . . .	35
[3]	Motions . . . . .	36
[4]	Settlement Negotiations and Mediation . . . . .	38
[5]	Pre-Trial Conference . . . . .	38
[D]	Trial . . . . .	39
[1]	Trial — Part 1 . . . . .	39
[2]	Trial — Part 2 . . . . .	41
[E]	Appeal . . . . .	42
<b>Chapter 2 NEGLIGENCE LAW: BREACH OF DUTY . . . . .</b>		<b>47</b>
§ 2.01	OVERVIEW OF NEGLIGENCE LAW . . . . .	48
[A]	Outline of the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	49
[B]	Overview of the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	50
[1]	Duty . . . . .	50
[2]	Breach of Duty . . . . .	50
[3]	Causation (Cause-in-Fact) . . . . .	50
[4]	Scope of Liability (Proximate Cause) . . . . .	50
[5]	Damages . . . . .	51
[C]	Defenses to a Negligence Case . . . . .	51
[D]	Proving the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	51
§ 2.02	ANALYSIS OF THE ELEMENTS OF A NEGLIGENCE CASE . . . . .	52
[A]	Analysis of a Negligence Case . . . . .	52
	<i>Rudolph v. Arizona B.A.S.S. Federation</i> . . . . .	53
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	58
[B]	Putting the Analysis of a Negligence Case All Together . . . . .	64
§ 2.03	THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD . . . . .	65
§ 2.04	THE REASONABLE PERSON . . . . .	66
[A]	General Characteristics . . . . .	66
	<i>Reed v. Tacoma Ry. &amp; P. Co.</i> . . . . .	67
	OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, THE COMMON LAW . . . . .	67
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	68
[B]	Reasonable Men and Women . . . . .	70
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	71
[C]	Emergency . . . . .	72
	<i>Foster v. Strutz</i> . . . . .	72
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	74



---

## Table of Contents

[D]	Physically Different Characteristics . . . . .	77
[E]	Mentally Disabled Individuals . . . . .	77
	<i>Bashi v. Wodarz</i> . . . . .	77
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	80
[F]	Children . . . . .	82
	<i>Robinson v. Lindsay</i> . . . . .	83
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	85
	Ethics Note — Advocate’s Role . . . . .	87
	Superior Skill Problem . . . . .	88
§ 2.05	DEVELOPING THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD . . . . .	89
[A]	Balancing Risk vs. Untaken Precautions . . . . .	89
	<i>United States v. Carroll Towing Co.</i> . . . . .	89
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	90
	Mark F. Grady, <i>Untaken Precautions</i> . . . . .	96
	<i>McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc.</i> . . . . .	98
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	100
	The Missing Rearview Mirror Problem . . . . .	103
	The Dangerous Bus Stop Problem . . . . .	104
[B]	Role of Custom . . . . .	106
	<i>Hagerman Construction, Inc. v. Copeland</i> . . . . .	106
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	107
	<i>Trimarco v. Klein</i> . . . . .	107
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	110
	<i>The T. J. Hooper</i> . . . . .	113
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	114
	The Careless Driver Problem . . . . .	115
§ 2.06	ALTERNATIVES TO THE REASONABLE CARE STANDARD . . . . .	116
[A]	Specific Judicial Standards . . . . .	116
	<i>Baltimore &amp; Ohio R.R. Co. v. Goodman</i> . . . . .	117
	<i>Pokora v. Wabash Ry. Co.</i> . . . . .	117
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	120
[B]	Safety Statutes and Regulations as Standards . . . . .	121
	<i>Ferrell v. Baxter</i> . . . . .	122
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	126
	<i>Wright v. Brown</i> . . . . .	129
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	131
[1]	Relationship of Statutory Standards to the Reasonable Care Standard . . . . .	132
[2]	The Role of Excuses . . . . .	133
	The Headlights Problem . . . . .	136
[3]	Negligence Per Se vs. Child Standard of Care . . . . .	137

---

## Table of Contents

	<i>Bauman v. Crawford</i> . . . . .	138
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	141
	Childproof Cap Problem . . . . .	142
	Keys in Ignition Problem . . . . .	142
§ 2.07	PROOF OF NEGLIGENCE . . . . .	142
[A]	Circumstantial Proof . . . . .	143
	<i>Clark v. Kmart Corp.</i> . . . . .	143
	Circumstantial Evidence in Negligence . . . . .	145
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	146
	Ethics Note — Advocate’s Role . . . . .	146
[B]	Res Ipsa Loquitur . . . . .	147
	<i>Byrne v. Boadle</i> . . . . .	147
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	148
	<i>Eaton v. Eaton</i> . . . . .	149
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	150
[1]	The Defendant’s Responsibility — The “Control” Element . . . . .	152
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	154
	<i>Ybarra v. Spangard</i> . . . . .	155
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	158
	The Falling Steer Problem . . . . .	160
	The Rolling Car Problem . . . . .	161
§ 2.08	THE STANDARD OF CARE IN PROFESSIONAL MALPRACTICE . . . . .	161
[A]	Negligent Medical Performance . . . . .	162
	<i>Smith v. Finch</i> . . . . .	162
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	164
[B]	The Doctrine of Informed Consent . . . . .	171
	<i>Phillips v. Hull</i> . . . . .	171
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	175
	Medical Malpractice Problem . . . . .	178
[C]	Legal Malpractice and the Liability of Other Professionals . . . . .	179
	<i>Smith v. Lewis</i> . . . . .	179
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	182
§ 2.09	PUTTING BREACH OF DUTY ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	184
	The Glass Patio Door Problem . . . . .	184
	Electroshock Therapy Problem . . . . .	186
	Ethics Note — Advocate’s Role . . . . .	186
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	187
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>DUTY . . . . .</b>	<b>189</b>
§ 3.01	GENERAL DUTY PRINCIPLE OF REASONABLE CARE . . . . .	190
	<i>MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.</i> . . . . .	192

---

## Table of Contents

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	197
	<i>A.W. v. Lancaster County School District</i> . . . . .	200
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	202
	Texting While Driving Problem . . . . .	204
§ 3.02	LIMITED DUTY RULES . . . . .	205
[A]	Owners and Occupiers of Land . . . . .	205
	<i>American Industries Life Insurance Co. v. Ruvalcaba</i> . . . . .	205
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	212
	Note on Child Visitors . . . . .	214
	<i>Rowland v. Christian</i> . . . . .	216
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	221
	Duty Analysis Note . . . . .	223
	Restatement 3d Problem . . . . .	226
	Ice Caves Mountain Problem . . . . .	226
[B]	Limited Duties to Act Affirmatively to Prevent Harm . . . . .	227
[1]	To Assist or Rescue . . . . .	227
	<i>Yania v. Bigan</i> . . . . .	230
	<i>Farwell v. Keaton</i> . . . . .	231
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	236
	Duty to Act Reform Statute Drafting Problem . . . . .	242
[2]	To Take Protective Measures Against Risks Posed by Third Persons . . . . .	243
	<i>Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California</i> . . . . .	243
	<i>Estates of Morgan v. Fairfield Family Counseling Ctr.</i> . . . . .	249
	<i>Dunkle v. Food Service East</i> . . . . .	253
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	254
	Note on Abuse Reporting Statutes as a Source of Duty . . . . .	260
[3]	To Protect Against Criminal Conduct . . . . .	260
	<i>Delta Tau Delta v. Johnson</i> . . . . .	260
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	265
	Note on Duty of Gun Manufacturers to Protect Against Gun Violence . . . . .	268
	Note on Duty of Alcohol Providers . . . . .	270
	Note on Negligent Entrustment . . . . .	271
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	271
[4]	Public Duty Doctrine . . . . .	273
	<i>Cuffy v. City of New York</i> . . . . .	273
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	277
	The Designated Driver Problem . . . . .	280
	Problem: Who Shot Arnold Schuster? . . . . .	281
	The Involuntary Police Decoy Problem . . . . .	282

---

## Table of Contents

	Ethics Note — Advocate’s Role . . . . .	282
[C]	Limited Duties Regarding the Type of Harm . . . . .	283
[1]	Emotional Distress Injuries . . . . .	283
[a]	Persons Subject to Direct Physical Risk . . . . .	285
	<i>Mitchell v. Rochester Ry. Co.</i> . . . . .	285
[b]	Bystander Emotional Harm — Persons Outside the Zone of Danger . . . . .	286
	<i>Clohessy v. Bachelor</i> . . . . .	287
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	293
[c]	Independent Duty for Emotional Well-Being . . . . .	299
	<i>Burgess v. Superior Court</i> . . . . .	301
	<i>Huggins v. Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.</i> . . . . .	305
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	307
	<i>Boyles v. Kerr</i> . . . . .	310
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	311
[d]	Duty to Protect Against Fear of Future Disease . . . . .	314
	<i>Majca v. Beekil</i> . . . . .	314
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	316
	Fear Resulting from Misdiagnosis Problem . . . . .	319
	Fertility Problem . . . . .	320
[2]	Pre-Natal Torts . . . . .	320
	<i>Greco v. United States</i> . . . . .	321
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	327
[3]	Consortium Loss . . . . .	331
[4]	Pure Economic Loss . . . . .	336
	<i>People Express Airlines, Inc. v. Consolidated Rail Corp.</i> . . . . .	337
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	342
	Note on the Source of Law Making Role of Courts in the Common Law System . . . . .	347
§ 3.03	PUTTING DUTY ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	351
[A]	Duty Analysis Framework . . . . .	351
[B]	Duty Practice Problems . . . . .	355
	Pumping Gas to Drunks Problem . . . . .	355
	Physician Liability to Third Parties Problem . . . . .	355
	Criminal Attack on Delivery Person Problem . . . . .	356
	The Fierce Doberman Problem . . . . .	357
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	357
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>CAUSATION . . . . .</b>	<b>359</b>
§ 4.01	THE CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF CAUSATION . . . . .	360
[A]	But For Causation . . . . .	360

---

## Table of Contents

	<i>Sowles v. Moore</i> . . . . .	360
	<i>New York Central R.R. Co. v. Grimstad</i> . . . . .	361
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	362
[B]	The Substantial Factor Test . . . . .	362
	<i>Corey v. Havener</i> . . . . .	363
	<i>Smith v. J. C. Penney Co., Inc.</i> . . . . .	364
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	364
[C]	Proof of Causation . . . . .	366
[1]	Cumulating Proof to Identify the Cause . . . . .	366
	<i>Ingersoll v. Liberty Bank of Buffalo</i> . . . . .	366
	Clarence Morris & C. Robert Morris, Jr., <i>Proving Causation</i> <i>Note</i> . . . . .	369
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	372
[2]	Untaken Precautions: Proving the Counterfactual . . . . .	374
	<i>Zuchowicz v. United States</i> . . . . .	374
	<i>Williams v. Utica College</i> . . . . .	377
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	385
	Wex S. Malone, <i>Ruminations on Cause-in-Fact</i> . . . . .	389
[3]	Multiple Parties: Apportionment of Damages or Joint Liability . . . .	391
	<i>Fugere v. Pierce</i> . . . . .	391
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	394
	Note on Joint and Several Liability . . . . .	395
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	398
	Ethics Note Lying in Negotiations . . . . .	399
§ 4.02	LOSS OF A CHANCE OF RECOVERY . . . . .	400
	<i>Matsuyama v. Birnbaum</i> . . . . .	400
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	409
§ 4.03	USING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EVIDENCE TO PROVE CAUSATION . . . . .	411
	Note on Scientific Evidence to Prove Causation . . . . .	411
	Note on the <i>Daubert</i> Trilogy . . . . .	414
	<i>Globetti v. Sandoz Pharmaceuticals Corp.</i> . . . . .	415
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	423
§ 4.04	PROVING WHO CAUSED THE HARM . . . . .	428
[A]	Alternative Liability . . . . .	428
	<i>Summers v. Tice</i> . . . . .	428
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	430
[B]	Market Share Liability . . . . .	431
[1]	Market Share Theory . . . . .	431
	<i>Hymowitz v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> . . . . .	431
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	437
[2]	Application of Market Share Theory to Residential Lead Paint	

---

## Table of Contents

	Problem . . . . .	439
	<i>Brenner v. American Cyanamid Co.</i> . . . . .	440
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	441
§ 4.05	PUTTING CAUSATION TOGETHER . . . . .	444
	The Newspaper Wire Problem . . . . .	444
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	445
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>SCOPE OF LIABILITY (PROXIMATE CAUSE) . . . . .</b>	<b>447</b>
§ 5.01	THE CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF SCOPE OF LIABILITY . . . . .	448
[A]	The Direct Consequences Test . . . . .	449
[B]	The Foresight Test . . . . .	450
§ 5.02	APPLICATIONS OF THE FORESIGHT RULE . . . . .	452
[A]	Unforeseeable Plaintiffs . . . . .	452
	<i>Palsgraf v. Long Island R.R. Co.</i> . . . . .	452
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	456
[B]	Unforeseeable Consequences . . . . .	459
	<i>Juisti v. Hyatt Hotel Corp. of Maryland</i> . . . . .	459
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	461
	Clarence Morris & C. Robert Morris, Jr., <i>Note on Lawyer Advocacy</i> <i>on Scope of Liability Issues</i> . . . . .	464
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	466
	Reconciling Foresight in the Breach and Scope Elements . . . . .	466
[C]	Intervening Forces . . . . .	469
[1]	Criminal Conduct of a Third Person . . . . .	469
	<i>McClenahan v. Cooley</i> . . . . .	469
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	472
	<i>Price v. Blaine Kern Artista, Inc.</i> . . . . .	473
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	474
[2]	Shifting Responsibility Issue . . . . .	474
	<i>McLaughlin v. Mine Safety Appliances Co.</i> . . . . .	475
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	480
	<i>Bigbee v. Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co.</i> . . . . .	482
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	485
§ 5.03	EXCEPTIONS TO THE FORESIGHT RULE . . . . .	486
[A]	The Medical Malpractice Complications Rule . . . . .	486
	<i>Association for Retarded Citizens-Volusia v. Fletcher</i> . . . . .	486
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	489
[B]	The Eggshell [Thin-Skulled] Plaintiff Rule . . . . .	490
	<i>Pace v. Ohio Dep't. of Transp.</i> . . . . .	490
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	493
[C]	The Rescuer Rule . . . . .	494

---

## Table of Contents

	<i>Sears v. Morrison</i> .....	494
	Notes & Questions .....	495
§ 5.04	FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING SCOPE OF LIABILITY .....	499
[A]	Foresight Analysis .....	499
[1]	Unforeseeable Plaintiffs and Unforeseeable Consequences .....	499
[2]	Intervening Forces and Shifting Responsibility .....	500
[B]	Existing Exceptions to the Foresight Test .....	501
	Sampling of Cases on Scope of Liability .....	502
	Legal Advocacy Problem .....	503
§ 5.05	PUTTING SCOPE OF LIABILITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER .....	507
	Accomplishment Note .....	509
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>DAMAGES</b> .....	<b>511</b>
§ 6.01	PERSONAL INJURY DAMAGES .....	512
	<i>Calva-Cerqueira v. United States</i> .....	515
	Notes & Questions .....	522
§ 6.02	PAIN, SUFFERING, AND EMOTIONAL DISTRESS .....	529
§ 6.03	LOSS OF ENJOYMENT OF LIFE DAMAGES .....	533
	<i>McDougald v. Garber</i> .....	534
	Notes & Questions .....	540
§ 6.04	WRONGFUL DEATH .....	542
	California Code of Civil Procedure § 377.20 — Survival Statute .....	543
	California Code of Civil Procedure § 377.60 — Wrongful Death Statute ..	544
	<i>Krouse v. Graham</i> .....	544
	Notes & Questions .....	546
§ 6.05	RACIAL, GENDER, COHABITATION, & CLASS FAIRNESS IN TORT .....	551
[A]	Racial Fairness in Tort Damages .....	554
	<i>McMillan v. The City of New York</i> .....	554
	Notes & Questions .....	559
	Note on Racial Bias in Personal Injury Damages Awards .....	563
[B]	Gender Fairness in Tort Damages .....	564
	<i>Gray v. Macklin,</i> .....	567
	Notes & Questions .....	569
	<i>Reilly v. United States</i> .....	571
	Notes & Questions .....	572
	Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problems .....	577
[C]	Cohabitation Status Fairness in Tort .....	577
	<i>Smith v. Bell Sports, Inc.</i> .....	578
	<i>Sykes v. Propane Power Corp.</i> .....	580
	Note on Cohabitation and the Law .....	583

---

## Table of Contents

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	585
	Cohabitation Wrongful Death Reform Problem . . . . .	587
[D]	Class Status Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	587
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	587
§ 6.06	PUNITIVE DAMAGES . . . . .	589
[A]	Punitive Damages Under State Tort Law . . . . .	590
	<i>Mathias v. Accor Economy Lodging, Inc.</i> . . . . .	590
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	594
[B]	Constitutional Protections Against Excessive Punitive Damage	
	Awards . . . . .	596
	<i>State Farm Mutual Auto, Ins. Co. v. Campbell</i> . . . . .	596
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	602
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	604
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>DEFENSES AND IMMUNITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>605</b>
§ 7.01	CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE . . . . .	606
§ 7.02	COMPARATIVE FAULT . . . . .	607
[A]	The Basic Policy . . . . .	607
	<i>Hoffman v. Jones</i> . . . . .	608
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	611
[B]	Factors in Assigning Percentages of Fault . . . . .	613
	<i>Wassell v. Adams</i> . . . . .	613
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	617
§ 7.03	ASSUMPTION OF RISK . . . . .	623
[A]	Express Assumption of Risk . . . . .	623
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	624
	Whitewater Trip Waiver Problem . . . . .	626
[B]	Implied Assumption of Risk . . . . .	627
	<i>Bowen v. Cochran</i> . . . . .	627
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	631
	<i>Murray v. Ramada Inns, Inc.</i> . . . . .	632
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	638
[C]	Primary Assumption of Risk — Limited Duty . . . . .	640
	<i>Cheong v. Antablin</i> . . . . .	640
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	644
[D]	Review Problems . . . . .	646
	The Ultralight Aircraft Problem . . . . .	646
	The Flopper Problem . . . . .	646
§ 7.04	ANALYSIS UNDER DIFFERENT COMPARATIVE FAULT	
	SYSTEMS . . . . .	646
[A]	Comparative Fault Problems — Simple Two-Party Cases . . . . .	649



---

## Table of Contents

[B]	Set-Off . . . . .	650
[C]	Comparative Fault Problems — Multiple Parties and Multiple Claims . . . . .	651
§ 7.05	STATUTES OF LIMITATION . . . . .	652
	<i>Gaston v. Parsons</i> . . . . .	655
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	662
§ 7.06	CHARITABLE IMMUNITY . . . . .	666
§ 7.07	SPOUSAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	667
	The Changing Law Problem . . . . .	668
§ 7.08	PARENTAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	669
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	673
§ 7.09	GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY . . . . .	675
	<i>Harry Stoller &amp; Co., Inc. v. City of Lowell</i> . . . . .	676
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	680
	Discretionary Function Problems . . . . .	682
	Ethics Note — Conflict Of Interest . . . . .	683
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	683
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>INTENTIONAL TORTS . . . . .</b>	<b>685</b>
§ 8.01	OVERVIEW OF INTENTIONAL TORTS . . . . .	685
§ 8.02	ASSAULT, BATTERY, AND INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS . . . . .	686
	<i>Dickens v. Puryear</i> . . . . .	688
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	695
§ 8.03	THE MEANING OF INTENT . . . . .	695
	<i>White v. Muniz</i> . . . . .	695
	<i>Villa v. Derouen</i> . . . . .	697
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	701
	<i>Doe v. Johnson</i> . . . . .	704
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	706
	<i>Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc.</i> . . . . .	707
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	708
	<i>Hall v. McBryde</i> . . . . .	708
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	709
	<i>Vetter v. Morgan</i> . . . . .	709
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	710
§ 8.04	SHORT PROBLEMS ON BATTERY AND ASSAULT . . . . .	711
	Battery Problems . . . . .	711
	Assault Problems . . . . .	713
§ 8.05	INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS IN DISCRIMINATION CASES . . . . .	715
	<i>Brandon v. County of Richardson</i> . . . . .	716

---

## Table of Contents

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	722
	<i>Alcorn v. Ambro Engineering, Inc.</i> . . . . .	727
	<i>Swenson v. Northern Crop Insurance, Inc.</i> . . . . .	729
	<i>Graham v. Guilderland Central School District</i> . . . . .	731
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	733
§ 8.06	SHORT PRACTICE PROBLEMS ON INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS . . . . .	737
	The Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem . . . . .	737
§ 8.07	FALSE IMPRISONMENT . . . . .	740
	<i>Wal-Mart Stores v Cockrell</i> . . . . .	741
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	745
	False Imprisonment Problems . . . . .	746
§ 8.08	TRESPASS TO CHATTELS AND CONVERSION . . . . .	749
	<i>United States v. Arora</i> . . . . .	749
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	753
§ 8.09	DEFENSES AND PRIVILEGES . . . . .	757
[A]	Consent . . . . .	757
	<i>Hogan v. Tavzel</i> . . . . .	757
	<i>Hellriegel v. Tholl</i> . . . . .	759
	<i>Reavis v. Slominski</i> . . . . .	761
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	765
	Consent Problems . . . . .	766
[B]	Self-Defense and Defense of Others . . . . .	768
	<i>Bradley v. Hunter</i> . . . . .	768
	<i>Juarez-Martinez v. Deans</i> . . . . .	770
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	773
	Self-Defense and Defense of Others Problems . . . . .	775
[C]	Defense of Property . . . . .	777
	<i>Katko v. Briney</i> . . . . .	777
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	780
[D]	Necessity . . . . .	781
	<i>Rossi v. Del Duca</i> . . . . .	781
	<i>Vincent v. Lake Erie Transp. Co.</i> . . . . .	782
	<i>Eilers v. Coy</i> . . . . .	784
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	786
§ 8.10	PUTTING INTENTIONAL TORT ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	788
	Short Review Problems . . . . .	788
	University Mascot Problem . . . . .	789
	Spousal Abuse Problem . . . . .	791

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>TRESPASS TO LAND, NUISANCE, AND ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>797</b>
§ 9.01	TRESPASS TO LAND	798
	<i>Creel v. Crim</i>	798
	Notes & Questions	800
§ 9.02	NUISANCE	802
[A]	Private Nuisance	802
	<i>Prah v. Maretti</i>	802
	Notes & Questions	809
	<i>Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co.</i>	811
	Notes & Questions	816
[B]	Overlap of Trespass and Private Nuisance	818
	<i>Bradley v. Am. Smelting &amp; Ref. Co.</i>	818
	Notes & Questions	822
[C]	Public Nuisance	823
	<i>Pennsylvania Soc. for the Prevention of Cruelty To Animals v. Bravo Enterprises, Inc.</i>	823
	Notes & Questions	830
§ 9.03	ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES	832
	An Overview of Strict Liability	832
	<i>Klein v. Pyrodyne Corp.</i>	835
	Notes & Questions	841
	Transporting Gasoline Problem	847
	Accomplishment Note	848
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>PRODUCTS LIABILITY</b>	<b>849</b>
§ 10.01	THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY	850
[A]	Historical Background	850
	<i>Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co.</i>	853
	Notes & Questions	855
	<i>Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.</i>	856
	Notes & Questions	858
[B]	Restatement (Second) on Products Liability § 402A (1964)	859
	Notes & Questions	860
[C]	Types of Product Defects	861
[1]	Manufacturing Defects	862
[2]	Design Defects	862
[3]	Warning and Instruction Defects	863
[D]	Restatement (3d) on Products Liability (1998)	863
	Restatement (3d) on Products Liability (1998) Sections 1–2	863
	Notes & Questions	864

---

## Table of Contents

§ 10.02	THE PRIMA FACIE CASE OF STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY . . . .	865
[A]	Proper Parties and Transactions Subject to Strict Liability . . . . .	865
[B]	Defectiveness . . . . .	866
[1]	Manufacturing Defects . . . . .	866
[a]	Deviation from Design Specifications . . . . .	866
	<i>Welge v. Planters Lifesavers Co. Welge v. Planters Lifesavers</i> <i>Co.</i> . . . . .	866
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	870
[2]	Design Defects . . . . .	871
[a]	The Ordinary Consumer Expectations Test . . . . .	872
	<i>Leichtamer v. American Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	872
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	876
	<i>Campbell v. General Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	879
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	880
	<i>Floyd v. Bic Corp.</i> . . . . .	880
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	881
[b]	The Risk-Utility Test . . . . .	884
	<i>Valk Manufacturing Co. v. Rangaswamy</i> . . . . .	884
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	888
	Note on Hindsight vs. Foresight of Risks . . . . .	892
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	894
	<i>Vautour v. Body Masters Sports Industries</i> . . . . .	895
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	897
[c]	The Two-Pronged Test for Design Defect . . . . .	899
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	902
	Ethics Note — Confidentiality of Settlements . . . . .	903
[d]	Design Defects from a Proof Perspective . . . . .	904
	<i>Soule v. General Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	906
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	911
	<i>McCathern v. Toyota Motor Corp.</i> . . . . .	911
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	914
[3]	Warning and Product Information Defects . . . . .	919
[a]	Warning Defect Considerations . . . . .	919
	<i>Nowak v. Faberge U.S.A., Inc.</i> . . . . .	919
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	924
	<i>Ramirez v. Plough, Inc.</i> . . . . .	927
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	931
[b]	Post-Sale Warnings . . . . .	935
	<i>Lovick v. Wil-Rich</i> . . . . .	935
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	938
[c]	Prescription Drug Issues . . . . .	939

---

## Table of Contents

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	941
	<i>Bryant v. Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc.</i> . . . . .	944
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	947
[C]	Causation . . . . .	949
[1]	Generally . . . . .	949
[2]	Market Share Liability . . . . .	950
[3]	Successor Corporation Liability . . . . .	950
[D]	Scope of Liability . . . . .	951
[E]	Damages . . . . .	951
[1]	Recovery of Economic Losses . . . . .	952
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	953
§ 10.03	DEFENSES . . . . .	955
	<i>Whitehead v. Toyota Motor Corporation</i> . . . . .	955
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	958
§ 10.04	PUTTING PRODUCTS LIABILITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	961
	Drawstring Sweatshirt Problem . . . . .	962
	Household Cleaner Injury Problem . . . . .	962
	Folding Chair Problem . . . . .	963
	Scented Candle Problem . . . . .	963
	Baby Cushion Problem . . . . .	963
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	964
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>DEFAMATION LAW . . . . .</b>	<b>965</b>
§ 11.01	OVERVIEW OF COMMON LAW DEFAMATION AND DEFENSES . . . . .	966
[A]	Defamatory Statements . . . . .	968
[1]	Defamatory Meaning . . . . .	968
[a]	Opinion . . . . .	970
[2]	Defamatory to Whom? . . . . .	971
[3]	Manner of Communication . . . . .	972
[4]	Interpretation of the Communication . . . . .	973
[a]	Meaning and Context . . . . .	973
[5]	Pleading Issues . . . . .	973
[a]	Use of Extrinsic Facts — Inducement and Innuendo . . . . .	973
[b]	Identifying the Plaintiff — Colloquium . . . . .	974
[6]	Group Libel . . . . .	974
[B]	Publication (Communicating the Defamation) . . . . .	975
[C]	Falsity . . . . .	976
[D]	Causation . . . . .	976
[E]	Harm (Damages) . . . . .	976
	<i>Zeran v. Diamond Broad., Inc.</i> . . . . .	977
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	980

---

## Table of Contents

[F]	Defenses/Privileges . . . . .	985
[1]	Truth . . . . .	985
[2]	Absolute Privileges . . . . .	986
[3]	Qualified Privileges . . . . .	987
[a]	Statements Made to Protect One’s Own Interests . . . . .	987
[b]	Statements Made to Protect the Interests of the Recipient or a Third Party . . . . .	987
[c]	Statements Made to Protect Common Interests . . . . .	987
[d]	Fair Comment Privilege . . . . .	988
[e]	Fair and Accurate Report Privilege (and Privilege of Neutral Reportage) . . . . .	988
[4]	Retractions . . . . .	990
[5]	Statutes of Limitation . . . . .	990
[6]	Mitigation of Damages . . . . .	990
[G]	Courthouse Defamation Overview Problem . . . . .	991
	Questions for Courthouse Defamation Problem . . . . .	992
§ 11.02	THE “CONSTITUTIONALIZATION” OF DEFAMATION LAW: FIRST AMENDMENT PRIVILEGES . . . . .	993
[A]	Reputational Values vs. Free Speech Values . . . . .	994
[1]	Reputational Values . . . . .	994
[2]	Free Speech Values . . . . .	995
§ 11.03	CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES: PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND PUBLIC FIGURES . . . . .	996
	<i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i> . . . . .	996
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1007
	Analysis of Public Official and Public Figure Cases . . . . .	1010
§ 11.04	CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES: PRIVATE PERSONS . . . . .	1015
[A]	Matters of Public Concern . . . . .	1015
	<i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1015
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1023
[B]	Matters Not of Public Concern . . . . .	1025
	<i>Dun &amp; Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1025
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1033
	<i>Snead v. Redland Aggregates</i> . . . . .	1036
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1037
§ 11.05	DETERMINING STATUS . . . . .	1038
	<i>Lohrenz v. Donnelly</i> . . . . .	1038
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1043
§ 11.06	OPINION REVISITED . . . . .	1047
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1047
§ 11.07	PUTTING DEFAMATION ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	1049
	The Gossip Columnist Defamation Problem . . . . .	1049

---

## Table of Contents

	The Kinkajous Defamation Problem . . . . .	1050
	The Former Secretary of State Problem . . . . .	1053
	Animal Rights Problem . . . . .	1053
	Defamation Culpability Problems . . . . .	1054
<b>Chapter 12</b>	<b>PRIVACY . . . . .</b>	<b>1055</b>
§ 12.01	INTRODUCTION TO PRIVACY . . . . .	1056
[A]	Statutory Protection . . . . .	1057
[B]	Constitutional Protection . . . . .	1060
[C]	Common Law Protection . . . . .	1063
[D]	Freedom of Speech and Press . . . . .	1067
	Note on Internet Resources on Privacy . . . . .	1067
§ 12.02	INTRUSION . . . . .	1067
	<i>Stengart v. Loving Care Agency, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1067
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1072
	<i>Garrity v. John Hancock Mutual Life Ins. Co.</i> . . . . .	1074
	<i>Hernandez v. Hillslides, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1076
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1082
§ 12.03	PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE FACTS . . . . .	1086
	<i>Yath v. Fairview Clinics, N.P.</i> . . . . .	1086
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1088
	<i>Haynes v. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1092
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1099
§ 12.04	FALSE LIGHT INVASION OF PRIVACY . . . . .	1102
	<i>Crump v. Beckley Newspapers, Inc.</i> . . . . .	1102
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1111
§ 12.05	APPROPRIATION . . . . .	1115
	<i>Joe Dickerson &amp; Associates, LLC v. Dittmar</i> . . . . .	1115
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1119
§ 12.06	RIGHT OF PUBLICITY . . . . .	1121
	<i>Lugosi v. Universal Pictures</i> . . . . .	1122
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	1127
§ 12.07	PUTTING PRIVACY AND PUBLICITY ANALYSIS TOGETHER . . . . .	1131
	Air Crash Interview Problem . . . . .	1131
	Targeting Pregnant Shoppers Problem . . . . .	1131
	The Boastful Mayor Problem . . . . .	1131
	The Revenge Pornography Problem . . . . .	1132
	Absolut Marilyn Problem . . . . .	1132
	Selling Celebrities' Former Homes Problem . . . . .	1132
	The Sexual Harassment Problem . . . . .	1132
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	1134

---

*Table of Contents*

**TABLE OF CASES** ..... **TC-1**

---

**INDEX** ..... **I-1**

---



# Table of Problems

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION TO TORT LAW</b>	<b>1</b>
	The Coffee and Culpability Problems	13
	The Willful Misconduct Hypothetical	14
	The Actual McDonald's Negligence Case	16
	The No-Fault (Strict Liability) Hypothetical	23
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>NEGLIGENCE LAW: BREACH OF DUTY</b>	<b>47</b>
	Superior Skill Problem	88
	Emergency Problem	76
	The Missing Rearview Mirror Problem	103
	The Dangerous Bus Stop Problem	104
	The Careless Driver Problem	115
	The Headlights Problem	136
	Childproof Cap Problem	142
	Keys in Ignition Problem	142
	The Falling Steer Problem	160
	The Rolling Car Problem	161
	Medical Malpractice Problem	178
	The Glass Patio Door Problem	184
	Electroshock Therapy Problem	186
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>DUTY</b>	<b>189</b>
	Texting While Driving Problem	204
	Restatement (Third) Problem	226
	Ice Caves Mountain Problem	226
	Duty to Act Reform Statute Drafting Problem	242
	The Designated Driver Problem	280
	Who Shot Arnold Shuster? Problem	281
	The Involuntary Police Decoy Problem	282
	Fear Resulting from Misdiagnosis Problem	319
	Fertility Problem	320
	Pumping Gas to Drunks Problem	355
	Physician Liability to Third Parties Problem	355
	Criminal Attack on Delivery Person Problem	356
	The Fierce Doberman Problem	357
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>CAUSATION</b>	<b>359</b>
	Bad Brakes Problem	398
	Gallstone Diagnosis Problem	399
	Candlewatt Power Problem	399
	The Newspaper Wire Problem	444

---

## *Table of Problems*

<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>SCOPE OF LIABILITY (PROXIMATE CAUSE) . . . . .</b>	<b>447</b>
	Peripatetic Rat Problem . . . . .	468
	Legal Advocacy Problem . . . . .	503
	Oil Spill Tragedy Problem . . . . .	507
	Cat in the Hat Disaster . . . . .	507
	Exam Drafting Problem . . . . .	508
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>DAMAGES . . . . .</b>	<b>511</b>
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>DEFENSES AND IMMUNITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>605</b>
	Whitewater Trip Waiver Problem . . . . .	626
	The Ultralight Aircraft Accident Problem . . . . .	646
	The Flopper Problem . . . . .	646
	Comparative Fault Problems — Simple Two Party Cases . . . . .	649
	The Changing Law Problem . . . . .	668
	Parent-Child Immunity Problems . . . . .	674
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>INTENTIONAL TORTS . . . . .</b>	<b>685</b>
	Battery Problems . . . . .	711
	Assault Problems . . . . .	713
	Intentional Infliction of Emotional Harm Problems . . . . .	737
	The Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem . . . . .	740
	False Imprisonment Problems . . . . .	746
	Conversion Problem . . . . .	754
	Cyberspace Problem . . . . .	757
	Consent Problems . . . . .	766
	Self-Defense and Defense of Others Problems . . . . .	775
	Intentional Tort Review Problems 1–3 . . . . .	788
	University Mascot Problem . . . . .	789
	Spousal Abuse Problem . . . . .	791
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>TRESPASS TO LAND, NUISANCE, AND ABNORMALLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .</b>	<b>797</b>
	Trespass to Land: Short Problems . . . . .	801
	Transporting Gasoline Problem . . . . .	847
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>PRODUCTS LIABILITY . . . . .</b>	<b>849</b>
	Drawstring Sweatshirt Problem . . . . .	962
	Household Cleaner Injury Problem . . . . .	962
	Folding Chair Problem . . . . .	963
	Scented Candle Problem . . . . .	963
	Baby Cushion Problem . . . . .	963
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>DEFAMATION LAW . . . . .</b>	<b>965</b>
	Pleading Problem . . . . .	975
	Courthouse Defamation Overview Problem . . . . .	991

---

*Table of Problems*

The Gossip Columnist Defamation Problem . . . . .	1049
The Kinkajous Defamation Problem . . . . .	1050
The Former Secretary of State Problem . . . . .	1053
Animal Rights Problem . . . . .	1053
Defamation Culpability Problems . . . . .	1054
<b>Chapter 12</b>	
<b>PRIVACY . . . . .</b>	<b>1055</b>
Air Crash Interview Problem . . . . .	1131
Targeting Pregnant Shoppers Problems . . . . .	1131
The Boastful Mayor Problem . . . . .	1131
The Revenge Pornography Problem . . . . .	1132
Absolut Marilyn Problem . . . . .	1132
Selling Celebrities' Former Homes Problem . . . . .	1132
The Sexual Harassment Problem . . . . .	1132

