

2020

## Tort Law and Practice

Carol M. Suzuki

Lawrence C. Levine

Ibrahim J. Gassama

Joan E. Vogel

Dominick Vetri

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/law\\_facbookdisplay](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/law_facbookdisplay)

---

# Tort Law and Practice



# Tort Law and Practice

---

SIXTH 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 E. NASH PROFESSOR OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LAW SCHOOL

**Carol M. Suzuki**

PROFESSOR OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO SCHOOL OF LAW



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2020  
Carolina Academic Press, LLC  
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-5310-1847-4  
e-ISBN 978-1-5310-1848-1  
LCCN 2019955153

Carolina Academic Press  
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, my sister Binta F. Jalloh, and in loving memory  
of Lucille Solomon and Humu Fofanah.*

**Carol M. Suzuki**

*To my parents, George M. and Kaoru Suzuki.*



# Introduction

You are embarking 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 240 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 require 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, schoolteachers, musicians, philosophers and others into competent lawyers include careful reading, active listening, comprehending relevancy, critical evaluation, and 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 have given you a good start with many of these skills. You will develop them considerably more acutely 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 for students to learn 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 and injuries we experience, the personal and family relationships we create, the technology we use, and the societal mores we continue to evolve and reformulate. Tort law



is often invoked to provide compensation for newly recognized injuries, to correct inequities in our society, and to reform its own historic doctrines and practices. Lawyers have played an important role in the growth and development of negligence law through their advocacy on behalf of individual clients. They have been in the forefront of the struggle to expand the reach of legal protection in tort law to disfavored or marginalized groups. 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 non-profit sector, the health care industry, and professionals of all types. Tort law is often operative in the arena of technological change. The development of autonomous vehicles, products and systems relying on artificial intelligence pose new challenges for tort law. Lawyers have important roles in aiding the law's adaptation to such changing times. Tort law most definitely is not a stodgy, sterile, spiritless old compartment of the common law. Tort law is a vibrant, vital, and vigorous 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), products liability (defective products), 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 fault 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 include a number of limitations on tort recoveries, such as maximum damages ("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 attorneys' fee awards.

A course in tort law provides many opportunities to discuss, consider and include the diversity of our communities. The authors of the casebook are committed to making diversity and inclusion concerns critical components of the first-year learning process. There are cases, notes, and problems throughout the casebook that will assist any teacher who is inclined to engage students on such matters as they relate to tort law. We have employed the materials to teach torts with a clear appreciation of how issues of diversity and inclusion have been addressed, ignored, or dismissed by the civil justice system. A new Table of Diversity and Inclusion Materials has also been created for the convenience of teachers and students in identifying areas and problems that they may want to examine.

This 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; this 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, battery, and trespass to land were probably the first to develop. The law's function in these 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 the potential of 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 the early period of American history (before 1800), life was mostly agricultural in nature and injury resulting from the conduct of strangers was primarily intentional. Life was tough and unusually short compared to modern times. 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 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 of the development of tort 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 the effects of 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 remains at an unacceptably high level. 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, the emotional distress that arises from accidents, and death. 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 too large a segment of our population does not have access to health or disability insurance. With the passage of health care reform, more people have access to health insurance but still about 8.5 percent of the population or 27.5 million persons do not have insurance protection. We will have to examine whether the extension of health insurance coverage has lowered the costs of accidents and injuries. As you will see, tort law interacts in complex ways with health, disability, and liability 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. Looking at trial and appellate court operations, they include judicial salaries, courtroom facilities, jury fees, court clerks, secretaries, bailiffs, security guards, clerical personnel, building use costs, furniture, computers, network systems, utilities, cleaning expenses, and much more. 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 expense of selling and administering the insurance system through adjusters and supervisors. In addition, settlement and mediation of accident claims have become increasingly important in recent years.

Tort liability cannot be the only means of deterring accidents in our society. Administrative safety regulations, criminal laws, private industry 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.

Since most Torts courses are now 3 to 4 credit hours, we recognize that few teachers have the class time to also cover defamation and privacy. Accordingly, we have moved chapter 11 (Defamation) and chapter 12 (Privacy) from the Torts casebook and placed them on the Carolina Academic Press website as electronic documents. The two chapters are available to teachers for downloading for use in torts classes or in an advanced course. They have been revised and updated.

Your study of torts will provide you with an opportunity to learn much about the legal rules and policies underlying the personal injury civil justice system in the United States. Importantly, it will also teach you about the common law legal system. This knowledge will be helpful in your other law studies and in your law career years ahead. Welcome to torts.



# Book Guide

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 encourage 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 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. Case Briefing Guidelines are provided at the end of this Book Guide 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 diversity and inclusion—people of color, ethnic groups, gender, disabilities, sexual orientation, and gender identity. 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. There are cases, notes, and problems throughout the casebook that can be used to engage such matters as they relate to tort law. A new Table of Diversity and Inclusion Materials has also been created for the convenience of teachers and students in identifying areas and problems that they may want to examine. 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.

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 who 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 shorthand 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* (6th ed. 2018), abbreviated as "UNDERSTANDING TORTS"; and JOSEPH W. GLANNON, *THE LAW OF TORTS: EXAMPLES & EXPLANATIONS* (5th ed. 2015) 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 its 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 First, Torts copyright © 1934, 1938, 1939 by The American Law Institute. Reproduced with permission.

Restatement of the Law Second, Torts copyright © 1965 by The American Law Institute. Reproduced with permission.

Restatement of the Law Third, Torts: Liability for Physical and Emotional Harm copyright © 2009 by The American Law Institute. Reproduced with permission.

Restatement of the Law Third, Torts: Products Liability copyright © 1998 by The American Law Institute. Reproduced with permission.

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.

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).

Harmon, Brenda K., *Parent-Child Tort Immunity: The Supreme Court of Illinois Finally Gives This Doctrine the Attention It's Been Demanding*, 19 *S. ILL. U. L.J.* 633 (1995). Copyright © 1995.

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.

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.

MORRIS, CLARENCE & MORRIS, C. ROBERT, JR., *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).

West Publishing Co., several charts and graphs from LAWRENCE C. LEVINE, *SUM & SUBSTANCE QUICK REVIEW ON TORTS* (4th ed. 2009).

## Photographs & Artwork

Home icon made by Freepik from <https://www.flaticon.com>

Auto Accident icon made by Freepik from <https://www.flaticon.com>

Crosswalk icon made by Freepik from <https://www.flaticon.com>

Cyclist icon made by Scott de Jonge from <https://www.flaticon.com>. CC 3.0 BY.

## Cartoons

CALVIN & HOBBS © 1990 Watterson. Reprinted with permission of ANDREWS McMEEL SYNDICATION. All rights reserved.

CALVIN & HOBBS © 1995 Watterson. Reprinted with permission of ANDREWS McMEEL SYNDICATION. All rights reserved.

Linda Ziskin © 1998, 2002, 2003. 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 all the people who have influenced the development of the casebook over the years:

The many law faculty colleagues who were very helpful over the years in offering cogent suggestions for the revisions, and Professor Bryant Walker Smith for his suggestions on products liability and introducing us to tort law issues related to autonomous vehicle technology.

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 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.

Bailey Dobbs and Debby Warren brought their considerable faculty support competence and talents to the work on this sixth edition.

The numerous torts students I have had the pleasure of teaching and those who used this book in its various incarnations enabled me to develop many of the ideas for the casebook. I heartily thank them for their contributions. I am also indebted to my extremely competent and diligent research assistants for their work and insights on the six editions of the casebook: Amanda Bowers, 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 encouragement and inordinate patience with me as the book grew and developed and now has become a sixth edition.

### Lawrence C. Levine

My thanks to the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law for providing me a sabbatical to work on an earlier version of this project. Also thanks to my colleague, Julie Davies, for her 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 Haley Graves (McGeorge '20), Hannah Fortin (McGeorge '21), 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 previous editions of this casebook. I am especially grateful to Brian Nguyen, for the wonderful assistance he provided on the Sixth Edition. I am also

grateful to Lucinda Finley, 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 over the years.

### **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, Michelle McKinley, and Keith Aoki, for their 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 Esther Sherman, Ryan Peterson, Geena Lee, and Jazmyn Ortiz. I am also indebted to my faculty support colleague, Bailey Dobbs, who provided exceptional editorial assistance.

### **Carol M. Suzuki**

I thank my friend and colleague, April Land, who provided encouragement for me to co-author this book, and who is a constant advocate for justice. I am grateful to my mentors, Gay Gellhorn, Stephen Wizner, and J. Michael Norwood, who have supported my development as a teacher, and to Jane Aiken, who recommended this book to me when I began teaching torts. I appreciate Robert Schwartz, who along with April continues to submit to my annual draft Torts exam as I prepare and finalize it. I am indebted to my torts tutor and research assistant, Kori Nau (UNM '21), for her careful attention to detail, thorough research, and adept editing skills. I thank my students at the University of New Mexico School of Law for their enthusiasm to learn and insightfulness when discussing issues of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, class, fairness, and justice.

I recognize my UNM faculty colleagues for their forbearance as I prepared this book; the staff for their continual support; the librarians for their capable research to locate specific material that I seek; and the administration for recognizing the importance of this book to teaching at the law school and to my professional development. I am grateful to the Don L. and Mabel F. Dickason Professorship for supporting this endeavor. I am ever appreciative of Mae Quinn and the other participants of the 2019 Law Women's Writing Retreat for their kindness, creativity, and support. Finally, I thank my co-authors for their trust and confidence in providing me with an opportunity to join them in this endeavor.





# Summary of Contents

<b>Chapter 1 • Introduction to Tort Law</b> .....	3
<b>Part I</b> .....	4
§ 1.01 Introduction .....	4
§ 1.02 Accidents in the United States .....	5
§ 1.03 A Brief Historical Background of Tort Law .....	9
§ 1.04 The Culpability Spectrum in Tort Law .....	10
§ 1.05 The Functions and Goals of Negligence Law .....	13
§ 1.06 Hot Coffee and Culpability Problems .....	15
§ 1.07 Overview of Personal Injury Damages .....	30
<b>Part II</b> .....	34
§ 1.08 The Tort Law Litigation Process .....	34
<b>Chapter 2 • Negligence Law: Breach of Duty</b> .....	51
§ 2.01 Overview of Negligence Law .....	52
§ 2.02 Analysis of the Elements of a Negligence Case .....	56
§ 2.03 The Reasonable Care Standard .....	69
§ 2.04 The Reasonable Person .....	70
§ 2.05 Developing the Reasonable Care Standard .....	92
§ 2.06 Alternatives to the Reasonable Care Standard .....	119
§ 2.07 Proof of Negligence .....	145
§ 2.08 The Standard of Care in Professional Malpractice .....	164
§ 2.09 Putting Breach of Duty Analysis Together .....	187
<b>Chapter 3 • Duty</b> .....	191
§ 3.01 General Duty Principle of Reasonable Care .....	192
§ 3.02 Limited Duty Rules .....	208
§ 3.03 Putting Duty Analysis Together .....	347

<b>Chapter 4 • Causation</b> . . . . .	<b>355</b>
§ 4.01 The Conceptual Basis of Causation . . . . .	356
§ 4.02 Loss of a Chance of Recovery . . . . .	397
§ 4.03 Using Scientific and Technical Evidence to Prove Causation . . . . .	408
§ 4.04 Proving Who Caused the Harm . . . . .	419
§ 4.05 Putting Causation Together. . . . .	436
<b>Chapter 5 • Scope of Liability (Proximate Cause)</b> . . . . .	<b>439</b>
§ 5.01 The Conceptual Basis of Scope of Liability . . . . .	440
§ 5.02 Applications of the Foresight Rule . . . . .	444
§ 5.03 Exceptions to the Foresight Rule. . . . .	478
§ 5.04 Framework for Analyzing Scope of Liability. . . . .	492
§ 5.05 Putting Scope of Liability Analysis Together. . . . .	499
<b>Chapter 6 • Damages</b> . . . . .	<b>503</b>
§ 6.01 Personal Injury Damages. . . . .	504
§ 6.02 Pain, Suffering, and Emotional Distress . . . . .	517
§ 6.03 Wrongful Death . . . . .	521
§ 6.04 Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Class Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	530
§ 6.05 Cohabitation Status Fairness in Tort . . . . .	560
§ 6.06 Class Status Fairness in Tort Damages. . . . .	564
§ 6.07 Punitive Damages. . . . .	565
<b>Chapter 7 • Defenses and Immunities</b> . . . . .	<b>585</b>
§ 7.01 Contributory Negligence . . . . .	586
§ 7.02 Comparative Fault . . . . .	587
§ 7.03 Assumption of Risk. . . . .	602
§ 7.04 Analysis Under Different Comparative Fault Systems . . . . .	627
§ 7.05 Statutes of Limitation. . . . .	632
§ 7.06 Charitable Immunity . . . . .	645
§ 7.07 Spousal Immunity . . . . .	646
§ 7.08 Parental Immunity . . . . .	648
§ 7.09 Governmental Immunity. . . . .	654
<b>Chapter 8 • Intentional Torts</b> . . . . .	<b>665</b>
§ 8.01 Overview of Intentional Torts. . . . .	665
§ 8.02 Assault, Battery, and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress. . . . .	666
§ 8.03 The Meaning of Intent . . . . .	676
§ 8.04 Short Problems on Battery and Assault . . . . .	691

§ 8.05 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress in Discrimination Cases . . . . .	696
§ 8.06 Short Practice Problems on Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress . . . . .	719
§ 8.07 False Imprisonment . . . . .	722
§ 8.08 Trespass to Chattels and Conversion . . . . .	729
§ 8.09 Defenses and Privileges . . . . .	739
§ 8.10 Putting Intentional Tort Analysis Together . . . . .	771
<b>Chapter 9 • Trespass to Land, Nuisance, and Abnormally Dangerous Activities . . . . .</b>	<b>781</b>
§ 9.01 Trespass to Land . . . . .	782
§ 9.02 Nuisance . . . . .	786
§ 9.03 Abnormally Dangerous Activities . . . . .	819
<b>Chapter 10 • Products Liability . . . . .</b>	<b>835</b>
§ 10.01 The Development of Strict Liability . . . . .	836
§ 10.02 The Prima Facie Case of Strict Products Liability . . . . .	852
§ 10.03 Defenses . . . . .	944
§ 10.04 Putting Products Liability Analysis Together . . . . .	950

[Chapters 11 & 12 on Defamation and Privacy are available to Professors for student use on the Carolina Academic Press website at [caplaw.com/tortlaw6e](http://caplaw.com/tortlaw6e).]



# Table of Contents

<i>Dedications</i> .....	v
<i>Introduction</i> .....	vii
<i>Book Guide</i> .....	xiii
<i>Permissions</i> .....	xix
<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	xxi
<i>Summary of Contents</i> .....	xxv
<b>Table of Problems</b> .....	xliv
<b>Diversity and Inclusion Materials</b> .....	xlix
<b>Chapter 1 • Introduction to Tort Law</b> .....	3
<b>Part I</b> .....	4
§ 1.01 Introduction .....	4
§ 1.02 Accidents in the United States .....	5
§ 1.03 A Brief Historical Background of Tort Law .....	9
§ 1.04 The Culpability Spectrum in Tort Law .....	10
[A] Intended Harm: Intentional Torts .....	12
[B] Unintended Harm .....	12
[1] Negligence .....	12
[2] Recklessness .....	12
[3] Strict Liability (No Fault Liability) .....	13
§ 1.05 The Functions and Goals of Negligence Law .....	13
[A] Deterrence and Accident Prevention .....	14
[B] Compensation .....	14
[C] Avoidance of Undue Burdens on Economic Activities .....	14
[D] Effective and Efficient Legal Process .....	15
[E] Fairness .....	15
§ 1.06 Hot Coffee and Culpability Problems .....	15
[A] The Willful Misconduct Problem .....	16
[B] The Actual McDonald’s Negligence (and Recklessness) Case .....	18

Notes & Questions . . . . .	20
[C] The No Fault (Strict Liability) Problem. . . . .	27
[1] Strict Liability . . . . .	27
[2] Compensation Systems . . . . .	29
§ 1.07 Overview of Personal Injury Damages . . . . .	30
<b>Part II</b> . . . . .	34
§ 1.08 The Tort Law Litigation Process . . . . .	34
[A] Lawyer Consultation . . . . .	35
[1] Interview . . . . .	35
[2] Research . . . . .	36
[3] Preliminary Investigation . . . . .	36
[4] The Defense Lawyer’s Perspective . . . . .	36
[B] Pleadings . . . . .	36
[1] Complaint . . . . .	36
[2] Answer and Counterclaims. . . . .	37
[3] Motions . . . . .	37
[C] Pre-Trial Procedure . . . . .	38
[1] Investigation . . . . .	38
[2] Discovery. . . . .	38
[3] Motions . . . . .	40
[4] Settlement Negotiations and Mediation . . . . .	42
[5] Pre-Trial Conference . . . . .	43
[D] Trial . . . . .	43
[1] Trial—Part 1 . . . . .	43
[2] Trial—Part 2 . . . . .	45
[E] Appeal . . . . .	47
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	50
<b>Chapter 2 • Negligence Law: Breach of Duty</b> . . . . .	51
§ 2.01 Overview of Negligence Law . . . . .	52
[A] Outline of the Elements of a Negligence Case. . . . .	53
[B] Overview of the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	53
[1] Duty . . . . .	53
[2] Breach of Duty . . . . .	54
[3] Causation (Cause-In-Fact) . . . . .	54
[4] Scope of Liability (Proximate Cause). . . . .	54
[5] Damages . . . . .	55
[C] Defenses to a Negligence Case . . . . .	55
[D] Proving the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	55
§ 2.02 Analysis of the Elements of a Negligence Case . . . . .	56
[A] Analysis of a Negligence Case . . . . .	56

	<i>Rudolph v. Arizona B.A.S.S. Federation</i> . . . . .	57
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	62
	[B] Putting the Analysis of a Negligence Case All Together . . . . .	68
§ 2.03	The Reasonable Care Standard . . . . .	69
§ 2.04	The Reasonable Person . . . . .	70
	[A] General Characteristics . . . . .	70
	<i>Reed v. Tacoma Ry. &amp; P. Co.</i> . . . . .	71
	THE COMMON LAW, Oliver Wendell Holmes . . . . .	71
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	72
	[B] Reasonable Men and Women . . . . .	74
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	75
	[C] Emergency . . . . .	76
	<i>Foster v. Strutz</i> . . . . .	77
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	79
	[D] Physically Different Characteristics . . . . .	81
	[E] Mentally Disabled Individuals . . . . .	82
	<i>Bashi v. Wodarz</i> . . . . .	82
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	85
	[F] Children . . . . .	86
	<i>Robinson v. Lindsay</i> . . . . .	87
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	89
	Superior Skill Problem . . . . .	91
§ 2.05	Developing the Reasonable Care Standard . . . . .	92
	[A] Balancing Risk vs. Untaken Precautions . . . . .	92
	<i>United States v. Carroll Towing Co.</i> . . . . .	92
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	93
	<i>Untaken Precautions</i> , Mark F. Grady . . . . .	99
	<i>McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc.</i> . . . . .	100
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	102
	The Missing Rearview Mirror Problem . . . . .	105
	The Dangerous Bus Stop Problem . . . . .	106
	[B] Role of Custom . . . . .	108
	<i>Hagerman Construction, Inc. v. Copeland</i> . . . . .	108
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	109
	<i>Trimarco v. Klein</i> . . . . .	109
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	112
	<i>The T.J. Hooper</i> . . . . .	115
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	116
	The Careless Driver Problem . . . . .	117
§ 2.06	Alternatives to the Reasonable Care Standard . . . . .	119
	[A] Specific Judicial Standards . . . . .	119
	<i>Baltimore &amp; Ohio R.R. Co. v. Goodman</i> . . . . .	119
	<i>Pokora v. Wabash Ry. Co.</i> . . . . .	120



Notes & Questions . . . . .	122
[B] Safety Statutes and Regulations as Standards . . . . .	124
<i>Ferrell v. Baxter</i> . . . . .	124
Notes & Questions . . . . .	128
<i>Wright v. Brown</i> . . . . .	131
Notes & Questions . . . . .	133
[1] Relationship of Statutory Standards to the Reasonable Care Standard . . . . .	135
[2] The Role of Excuses . . . . .	135
The Headlights Problem . . . . .	139
Framework for Using Statutes in Negligence Cases . . . . .	140
[3] Negligence Per Se vs. Child Standard of Care . . . . .	140
<i>Bauman v. Crawford</i> . . . . .	140
Notes & Questions . . . . .	144
Childproof Cap Problem . . . . .	145
Keys in Ignition Problem . . . . .	145
§ 2.07 Proof of Negligence . . . . .	145
[A] Circumstantial Proof . . . . .	146
<i>Clark v. Kmart Corp.</i> . . . . .	146
Circumstantial Evidence in Negligence . . . . .	148
Notes & Questions . . . . .	149
[B] Res Ipsa Loquitur . . . . .	150
<i>Byrne v. Boadle</i> . . . . .	150
Notes & Questions . . . . .	151
<i>Eaton v. Eaton</i> . . . . .	151
Notes & Questions . . . . .	153
[1] The Defendant's Responsibility—The "Control" Element . . . . .	155
Notes & Questions . . . . .	156
<i>Ybarra v. Spangard</i> . . . . .	158
Notes & Questions . . . . .	161
The Falling Steer Problem . . . . .	163
The Rolling Car Problem . . . . .	164
§ 2.08 The Standard of Care in Professional Malpractice . . . . .	164
[A] Negligent Medical Performance . . . . .	165
<i>Smith v. Finch</i> . . . . .	165
Notes & Questions . . . . .	167
[B] The Doctrine of Informed Consent . . . . .	173
<i>Phillips v. Hull</i> . . . . .	173
Notes & Questions . . . . .	177
Medical Malpractice Problem . . . . .	180
[C] Legal Malpractice and the Liability of Other Professionals . . . . .	181
<i>Smith v. Lewis</i> . . . . .	182
Notes & Questions . . . . .	185

§ 2.09 Putting Breach of Duty Analysis Together . . . . .	187
The Glass Patio Door Problem . . . . .	187
Electroshock Therapy Problem . . . . .	189
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	189
<b>Chapter 3 • Duty . . . . .</b>	<b>191</b>
§ 3.01 General Duty Principle of Reasonable Care . . . . .	192
<i>MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.</i> . . . . .	194
Notes & Questions . . . . .	200
Duty Under the Restatement (Third) of Torts:	
Disagreements Over the Role of Foresight in	
Duty Analysis . . . . .	203
<i>A.W. v. Lancaster County School District</i> . . . . .	203
Restatement (Third) of Torts . . . . .	204
Notes & Questions . . . . .	205
Texting While Driving Problem . . . . .	207
§ 3.02 Limited Duty Rules . . . . .	208
[A] Owners and Occupiers of Land . . . . .	208
<i>American Industries Life Insurance Co. v. Ruvalcaba.</i> . . . .	208
Notes & Questions . . . . .	215
Note on Child Visitors—Attractive Nuisance . . . . .	216
<i>Rowland v. Christian</i> . . . . .	217
Notes & Questions . . . . .	223
Duty Analysis Note . . . . .	225
Public Policies Influencing Duty Decisions . . . . .	226
Analyzing Public Policy Considerations in Torts Cases . . . . .	227
Restatement (Third) Problem . . . . .	227
Ice Caves Mountain Problem . . . . .	228
[B] Limited Duties to Act Affirmatively to Prevent Harm . . . . .	229
[1] To Assist or Rescue . . . . .	229
Restatement (Second) of Torts Illustration . . . . .	230
A Shocking Failure to Act Results in Death . . . . .	231
<i>Yania v. Bigan</i> . . . . .	232
<i>Farwell v. Keaton.</i> . . . .	233
Notes & Questions . . . . .	238
Duty to Act Reform Statute Drafting Problem . . . . .	243
[2] To Take Protective Measures Against Risks Posed by	
Third Persons . . . . .	244
<i>Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California</i> . . . . .	244
<i>Estates of Morgan v. Fairfield Family Counseling Ctr.</i> . . . .	250
<i>Dunkle v. Food Service East</i> . . . . .	254
Notes & Questions . . . . .	255
Child 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 . . . . .	266
Note on Duty of Alcohol Providers . . . . .	267
Note on Negligent Entrustment . . . . .	268
Notes & Questions . . . . .	268
[4] Public Duty Doctrine . . . . .	270
<i>Cuffy v. City of New York</i> . . . . .	270
Notes & Questions . . . . .	275
The Designated Driver Problem . . . . .	278
Problem: Who Shot Arnold Schuster? . . . . .	279
The Involuntary Police Decoy Problem . . . . .	279
Note on Duty: Some Considerations in the Autonomous Vehicle Era . . . . .	280
[C] Limited Duties Regarding the Type of Harm . . . . .	281
[1] Emotional Distress Injuries . . . . .	281
[a] Persons Subject to Direct Physical Risk . . . . .	283
<i>Mitchell v. Rochester Ry. Co.</i> . . . . .	283
[b] Bystander Emotional Harm—Persons Outside the Zone of Danger . . . . .	284
<i>Clohessy v. Bachelor</i> . . . . .	285
Notes & Questions . . . . .	291
[c] Independent Duty for Emotional Well-Being . . . . .	296
<i>Burgess v. Superior Court</i> . . . . .	298
<i>Huggins v. Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.</i> . . . . .	303
Notes & Questions . . . . .	305
<i>Boyles v. Kerr</i> . . . . .	307
Notes & Questions . . . . .	309
[d] Duty to Protect Against Fear of Future Disease . . . . .	311
<i>Majca v. Beekil</i> . . . . .	311
Notes & Questions . . . . .	314
Fear Resulting from Misdiagnosis Problem . . . . .	316
Fertility Problem . . . . .	317
[2] Pre-Natal Torts . . . . .	317
<i>Greco v. United States</i> . . . . .	318
Notes & Questions . . . . .	324
[3] Consortium Loss . . . . .	328
[4] Pure Economic Loss . . . . .	334
<i>People Express Airlines, Inc. v. Consolidated Rail Corp.</i> . . . . .	334
Notes & Questions . . . . .	339
Note on the Source of Law-Making Role of Courts	

in the Common Law System . . . . .	343
§ 3.03 Putting Duty Analysis Together . . . . .	347
[A] Duty Analysis Framework . . . . .	347
[B] Duty Practice Problems . . . . .	350
Pumping Gas to Drunks Problem . . . . .	350
Physician Liability to Third Parties Problem . . . . .	351
Criminal Attack on Delivery Person Problem . . . . .	352
The Fierce Doberman Problem . . . . .	353
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	353
<b>Chapter 4 • Causation . . . . .</b>	<b>355</b>
§ 4.01 The Conceptual Basis of Causation . . . . .	356
[A] But for Causation . . . . .	356
<i>Sowles v. Moore</i> . . . . .	356
<i>New York Central R.R. Co. v. Grimstad</i> . . . . .	357
Notes & Questions . . . . .	358
[B] The Substantial Factor Test . . . . .	358
<i>Corey v. Havener</i> . . . . .	359
<i>Smith v. J.C. Penney Co., Inc.</i> . . . . .	360
Notes & Questions . . . . .	360
[C] Proof of Causation . . . . .	362
[1] Cumulating Proof to Identify the Cause . . . . .	362
<i>Ingersoll v. Liberty Bank of Buffalo</i> . . . . .	362
Proving Causation Note	
Clarence Morris & C. Robert Morris, Jr., <i>Morris on Torts</i> . . . . .	366
Notes & Questions . . . . .	368
[2] Untaken Precautions: Proving the Counterfactual . . . . .	370
<i>Zuchowicz v. United States</i> . . . . .	370
<i>Williams v. Utica College</i> . . . . .	373
Notes & Questions . . . . .	382
<i>Ruminations on Cause-in-Fact</i> , Wex S. Malone . . . . .	386
[3] Multiple Parties: Apportionment of Damages or	
Joint Liability . . . . .	388
<i>Fugere v. Pierce</i> . . . . .	388
Notes & Questions . . . . .	392
Note on Joint and Several Liability . . . . .	392
Notes & Questions . . . . .	395
Bad Brakes Problem . . . . .	395
Gallstone Diagnosis Problem . . . . .	396
Candlewatt Power Problem . . . . .	396
Ethics Note Lying in Negotiations . . . . .	396
§ 4.02 Loss of a Chance of Recovery . . . . .	397
<i>Matsuyama v. Birnbaum</i> . . . . .	397

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	406
§ 4.03	Using Scientific and Technical Evidence to Prove Causation . . . . .	408
	Note on Scientific Evidence to Prove Causation. . . . .	409
	Note on the <i>Daubert</i> Trilogy. . . . .	412
	Application of the <i>Daubert</i> Trilogy: The Parlodel Cases . . . . .	413
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	415
§ 4.04	Proving Who Caused the Harm . . . . .	419
	[A] Alternative Liability . . . . .	419
	<i>Summers v. Tice</i> . . . . .	419
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	421
	[B] Market Share Liability . . . . .	422
	[1] Market Share Theory . . . . .	422
	<i>Hymowitz v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> . . . . .	422
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	429
	[2] Application of Market Share Theory to Residential Lead Paint Problem . . . . .	431
	<i>Brenner v. American Cyanamid Co.</i> . . . . .	432
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	433
§ 4.05	Putting Causation Together. . . . .	436
	Burned Sewer Line Problem . . . . .	436
	Accomplishment Note. . . . .	437
<b>Chapter 5 • Scope of Liability (Proximate Cause)</b>		<b>439</b>
§ 5.01	The Conceptual Basis of Scope of Liability . . . . .	440
	[A] The Direct Consequences Test . . . . .	441
	[B] The Foresight Test . . . . .	442
§ 5.02	Applications of the Foresight Rule . . . . .	444
	[A] Unforeseeable Plaintiffs. . . . .	444
	<i>Palsgraf v. Long Island R.R. Co.</i> . . . . .	444
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	449
	[B] Unforeseeable Consequences . . . . .	451
	<i>Juisti v. Hyatt Hotel Corp. of Maryland.</i> . . . . .	451
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	453
	Note on Lawyer Advocacy on Scope of Liability Issues . . . . .	456
	Clarence Morris & C. Robert Morris, Jr., <i>Morris on Torts</i> . . . . .	456
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	458
	Reconciling Foresight in the Breach and Scope Elements . . . . .	459
	Peripatetic Rat Problem. . . . .	460
	[C] Intervening Forces . . . . .	461
	[1] Criminal Conduct of a Third Person . . . . .	461
	<i>McClenahan v. Cooley</i> . . . . .	461
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	465

	<i>Price v. Blaine Kern Artista, Inc.</i> . . . . .	465
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	467
[2]	Shifting Responsibility Issue . . . . .	467
	<i>McLaughlin v. Mine Safety Appliances Co.</i> . . . . .	467
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	472
	<i>Bigbee v. Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co.</i> . . . . .	474
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	478
§ 5.03	Exceptions to the Foresight Rule . . . . .	478
	[A] The Medical Malpractice Complications Rule . . . . .	479
	<i>Association for Retarded Citizens-Volusia v. Fletcher.</i> . . . .	479
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	482
	[B] The Eggshell [Thin-Skulled] Plaintiff Rule . . . . .	483
	<i>Pace v. Ohio Department of Transportation</i> . . . . .	483
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	486
	[C] The Rescuer Rule . . . . .	487
	<i>Sears v. Morrison.</i> . . . .	487
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	488
§ 5.04	Framework for Analyzing Scope of Liability . . . . .	492
	Determining If There Is a Scope of Liability Issue Present . . .	492
	Analysis of Scope of Liability . . . . .	492
	[A] Foresight Analysis . . . . .	493
	[1] Unforeseeable Plaintiffs and Unforeseeable	
	Consequences . . . . .	493
	[2] Intervening Forces and Shifting Responsibility . . . . .	493
	[B] Existing Exceptions to the Foresight Test . . . . .	494
	Sampling of Cases on Scope of Liability . . . . .	495
	Legal Advocacy Problem . . . . .	496
§ 5.05	Putting Scope of Liability Analysis Together . . . . .	499
	Oil Spill Tragedy Problem . . . . .	499
	Cat in the Hat Disaster . . . . .	499
	Exam Drafting Problem . . . . .	500
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	501
<b>Chapter 6 • Damages</b> . . . . .		<b>503</b>
§ 6.01	Personal Injury Damages . . . . .	504
	<i>Calva-Cerqueira v. United States.</i> . . . .	506
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	512
§ 6.02	Pain, Suffering, and Emotional Distress . . . . .	517
§ 6.03	Wrongful Death . . . . .	521
	California Survival and Wrongful Death Statutes . . . . .	522
	Texas Wrongful Death Statute . . . . .	523
	<i>Krouse v. Graham</i> . . . . .	523

	Notes & Questions . . . . .	526
§ 6.04	Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Class Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	530
	[A] Introduction . . . . .	530
	Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children . . . . .	530
	[B] 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Fairness Principles in Damages Awards . . . . .	533
	[C] Race and Ethnicity Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	535
	<i>Tarpeh-Doe v. United States</i> . . . . .	535
	<i>McMillan v. City of New York</i> . . . . .	537
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	542
	[D] Gender Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	547
	<i>Gray v. Macklin</i> . . . . .	547
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	549
	<i>Reilly v. United States</i> . . . . .	550
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	552
	[E] Constitutional Dimensions . . . . .	556
	[F] Legislative Reform . . . . .	559
	Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem . . . . .	560
§ 6.05	Cohabitation Status Fairness in Tort . . . . .	560
	Note on Cohabitation and the Law . . . . .	561
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	563
	Cohabitation Wrongful Death Reform Problem . . . . .	564
	Consortium Rights of Children Problem . . . . .	564
§ 6.06	Class Status Fairness in Tort Damages . . . . .	564
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	565
§ 6.07	Punitive Damages . . . . .	565
	[A] Punitive Damages in State Courts . . . . .	567
	<i>Mathias v. Accor Economy Lodging, Inc.</i> . . . . .	567
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	572
	[B] Constitutional Protections Against Excessive Punitive Damage Awards . . . . .	574
	<i>State Farm Mutual Auto, Ins. Co. v. Campbell</i> . . . . .	574
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	580
	Accomplishment Note . . . . .	583
<b>Chapter 7 • Defenses and Immunities . . . . .</b>		<b>585</b>
§ 7.01	Contributory Negligence . . . . .	586
§ 7.02	Comparative Fault . . . . .	587
	[A] The Basic Policy . . . . .	587
	<i>Hoffman v. Jones</i> . . . . .	588

Notes & Questions . . . . .	592
[B] Factors in Assigning Percentages of Fault . . . . .	593
<i>Wassell v. Adams</i> . . . . .	593
Notes & Questions . . . . .	598
§ 7.03 Assumption of Risk. . . . .	602
[A] Express Assumption of Risk . . . . .	603
Notes & Questions . . . . .	603
Whitewater Trip Waiver Problem . . . . .	605
[B] Implied Assumption of Risk . . . . .	606
<i>Bowen v. Cochran</i> . . . . .	607
Notes & Questions . . . . .	610
<i>Murray v. Ramada Inns, Inc.</i> . . . . .	612
Notes & Questions . . . . .	618
[C] Primary Assumption of Risk—Limited Duty . . . . .	620
<i>Cheong v. Antablin</i> . . . . .	620
Notes & Questions . . . . .	624
[D] Review Problems . . . . .	626
The Ultralight Aircraft Problem . . . . .	626
The Flopper Problem . . . . .	626
§ 7.04 Analysis Under Different Comparative Fault Systems . . . . .	627
Colorado Statutes . . . . .	628
Oregon Statutes. . . . .	628
Florida Statutes . . . . .	629
[A] Comparative Fault Problems—Simple Two-Party Cases . . . . .	629
Two Parties Cause an Accident Where Only One is Harmed . . . . .	629
Problem 1 . . . . .	629
Problem 2 . . . . .	629
Problem 3 . . . . .	629
Problem 4 . . . . .	630
Problem 5 . . . . .	630
Two Parties Cause an Accident and Both Are Harmed . . . . .	630
Problem 6 . . . . .	630
Problem 7 . . . . .	630
Problem 8 . . . . .	630
[B] Set-Off . . . . .	631
Problem 9 . . . . .	631
[C] Comparative Fault Problems—Multiple Parties and Multiple Claims. . . . .	631
§ 7.05 Statutes of Limitation. . . . .	632
<i>Gaston v. Parsons</i> . . . . .	635
Notes & Questions . . . . .	641
§ 7.06 Charitable Immunity . . . . .	645



§ 7.07 Spousal Immunity . . . . .	646
The Changing Law Problem . . . . .	647
§ 7.08 Parental Immunity . . . . .	648
Notes & Questions . . . . .	652
§ 7.09 Governmental Immunity . . . . .	654
<i>Harry Stoller &amp; Co., Inc. v. City of Lowell</i> . . . . .	655
Notes & Questions . . . . .	659
Discretionary Function Problems . . . . .	662
Ethics Note—Conflict of Interest . . . . .	663
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	664
<b>Chapter 8 • Intentional Torts . . . . .</b>	<b>665</b>
§ 8.01 Overview of Intentional Torts . . . . .	665
§ 8.02 Assault, Battery, and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress . . . . .	666
<i>Dickens v. Puryear</i> . . . . .	668
Notes & Questions . . . . .	675
§ 8.03 The Meaning of Intent . . . . .	676
<i>White v. Muniz</i> . . . . .	676
<i>Villa v. Derouen</i> . . . . .	678
Notes & Questions . . . . .	682
<i>Doe v. Johnson</i> . . . . .	684
Notes & Questions . . . . .	686
<i>Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc.</i> . . . . .	687
Notes & Questions . . . . .	688
<i>Hall v. McBryde</i> . . . . .	689
Notes & Questions . . . . .	689
<i>Vetter v. Morgan</i> . . . . .	690
Notes & Questions . . . . .	691
§ 8.04 Short Problems on Battery and Assault . . . . .	691
Battery Problems . . . . .	691
Assault Problems . . . . .	694
§ 8.05 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress in Discrimination Cases . . . . .	696
<i>Brandon v. County of Richardson</i> . . . . .	697
Notes & Questions . . . . .	704
<i>Alcorn v. Anbro Engineering, Inc.</i> . . . . .	709
<i>Swenson v. Northern Crop Insurance, Inc.</i> . . . . .	711
<i>Graham v. Guilderland Central School District</i> . . . . .	713
Notes & Questions . . . . .	715
Hate Speech and Free Speech . . . . .	717
§ 8.06 Short Practice Problems on Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress . . . . .	719
The Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem . . . . .	721

§ 8.07 False Imprisonment . . . . .	722
<i>Wal-Mart Stores v. Cockrell</i> . . . . .	722
Notes & Questions . . . . .	726
False Imprisonment Problems . . . . .	728
§ 8.08 Trespass to Chattels and Conversion . . . . .	730
<i>United States v. Arora</i> . . . . .	730
<i>Spleenless in Seattle, THE LONDON INDEPENDENT</i> . . . . .	733
Notes & Questions . . . . .	734
§ 8.09 Defenses and Privileges . . . . .	739
[A] Consent . . . . .	739
<i>Hogan v. Tavzel</i> . . . . .	739
<i>Hellriegel v. Tholl</i> . . . . .	740
<i>Reavis v. Slominski</i> . . . . .	742
Notes & Questions . . . . .	747
Consent Problems . . . . .	749
[B] Self-Defense and Defense of Others . . . . .	751
<i>Bradley v. Hunter</i> . . . . .	751
<i>Juarez-Martinez v. Deans</i> . . . . .	753
Notes & Questions . . . . .	756
Self-Defense and Defense of Others Problems . . . . .	758
[C] Defense of Property . . . . .	760
<i>Katko v. Briney</i> . . . . .	760
Notes & Questions . . . . .	763
[D] Necessity . . . . .	764
<i>Rossi v. Del Duca</i> . . . . .	764
<i>Vincent v. Lake Erie Transp. Co.</i> . . . . .	765
<i>Eilers v. Coy</i> . . . . .	767
Notes & Questions . . . . .	769
§ 8.10 Putting Intentional Tort Analysis Together . . . . .	771
I. Short Review Problems (1–3) . . . . .	771
II. Sample Exam & Review Problem: University	
Mascot Problem . . . . .	772
Spousal Abuse Problem (Overlapping Criminal Law, Torts	
and Family Law Issues) . . . . .	774
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	779
<b>Chapter 9 • Trespass to Land, Nuisance, and Abnormally</b>	
<b>Dangerous Activities . . . . .</b>	<b>781</b>
§ 9.01 Trespass to Land . . . . .	782
<i>Creel v. Crim.</i> . . . .	782
Notes & Questions . . . . .	784
§ 9.02 Nuisance . . . . .	786
[A] Private Nuisance . . . . .	787

<i>Prah v. Maretti</i> . . . . .	787
Notes & Questions . . . . .	794
<i>Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co.</i> . . . . .	795
Notes & Questions . . . . .	801
[B] Overlap of Trespass and Private Nuisance . . . . .	803
<i>Bradley v. American Smelting &amp; Ref. Co.</i> . . . . .	803
Notes & Questions . . . . .	807
[C] Public Nuisance . . . . .	808
<i>Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to</i> <i>Animals v. Bravo Enterprises, Inc.</i> . . . . .	808
Notes & Questions . . . . .	815
§ 9.03 Abnormally Dangerous Activities . . . . .	819
An Overview of Strict Liability . . . . .	819
<i>Klein v. Pyrodyne Corp.</i> . . . . .	822
Notes & Questions . . . . .	828
Transporting Gasoline Problem . . . . .	833
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	834
<b>Chapter 10 • Products Liability</b> . . . . .	<b>835</b>
§ 10.01 The Development of Strict Liability . . . . .	836
[A] Historical Background . . . . .	836
<i>Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co.</i> . . . . .	839
Notes & Questions . . . . .	842
<i>Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.</i> . . . . .	843
Notes & Questions . . . . .	845
[B] Restatement (Second) on Products Liability § 402A (1964) . . . . .	846
RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF PRODUCTS LIABILITY	
§ 402A (1964) . . . . .	846
Notes & Questions . . . . .	847
[C] Types of Product Defects . . . . .	848
[1] Manufacturing Defects . . . . .	848
[2] Design Defects . . . . .	849
[3] Warning and Instruction Defects . . . . .	850
[D] Restatement 3d on Products Liability (1998) . . . . .	850
RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF PRODUCTS LIABILITY (1998) . . . . .	850
Notes & Questions . . . . .	851
§ 10.02 The Prima Facie Case of Strict Products Liability . . . . .	852
[A] Parties and Transactions Subject to Strict Liability . . . . .	853
Problem: Who Is a Seller in Strict Liability? . . . . .	854
[B] Defectiveness . . . . .	855
[1] Manufacturing Defects . . . . .	855
[a] Deviation from Design Specifications . . . . .	855

	<i>Welge v. Planters Lifesavers Co.</i> . . . . .	855
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	858
[2]	Design Defects . . . . .	860
	[a] The Ordinary Consumer Expectations Test . . . . .	860
	<i>Leichtamer v. American Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	861
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	865
	<i>Campbell v. General Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	868
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	869
	<i>Floyd v. Bic Corp.</i> . . . . .	870
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	871
	[b] The Risk-Utility Test . . . . .	873
	<i>Valk Manufacturing Co. v. Rangaswamy</i> . . . . .	874
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	878
	Note on Hindsight vs. Foresight of Risks . . . . .	883
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	884
	<i>Vautour v. Body Masters Sports Industries</i> . . . . .	885
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	887
	[c] The Two-Pronged Test for Design Defect . . . . .	890
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	892
	<i>Soule v. General Motors Corp.</i> . . . . .	894
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	899
	<i>McCathern v. Toyota Motor Corp.</i> . . . . .	901
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	903
	[d] Design Defectiveness Problems . . . . .	907
	The Bullet Proof Vest Problem . . . . .	907
	Car Roof Stability in Rollover Problem . . . . .	908
	Ladder State of the Art Problem . . . . .	908
	Hot Water Heater Design Defect Problem . . . . .	908
[3]	Warning and Product Information Defects . . . . .	909
	[a] Warning Defect Considerations . . . . .	909
	<i>Nowak v. Faberge U.S.A., Inc.</i> . . . . .	909
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	914
	<i>Ramirez v. Plough, Inc.</i> . . . . .	917
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	921
	[b] Post-Sale Warnings . . . . .	924
	<i>Lovick v. Wil-Rich</i> . . . . .	924
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	928
	[c] Prescription Drug Issues . . . . .	929
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	930
	<i>Bryant v. Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc.</i> . . . . .	933
	Notes & Questions . . . . .	936
[C]	Causation . . . . .	939
	[1] Generally . . . . .	939

[2] Market Share Liability . . . . .	940
[3] Successor Corporation Liability . . . . .	940
[D] Scope of Liability . . . . .	940
[E] Damages . . . . .	941
[1] Recovery of Economic Losses . . . . .	942
Notes & Questions . . . . .	943
§ 10.03 Defenses . . . . .	944
<i>Whitehead v. Toyota Motor Corporation</i> . . . . .	944
Notes & Questions . . . . .	947
§ 10.04 Putting Products Liability Analysis Together . . . . .	950
Drawstring Sweatshirt Problem . . . . .	950
Household Cleaner Injury Problem . . . . .	951
Folding Chair Problem . . . . .	952
Scented Candle Problem . . . . .	952
Baby Cushion Problem . . . . .	952
Accomplishment Note . . . . .	954
 [Chapters 11 & 12 on Defamation and Privacy are available to Professors for student use on the Carolina Academic Press website at <a href="http://caplaw.com/tortlaw6e">caplaw.com/tortlaw6e</a> .]	
Table of Cases . . . . .	955
Index . . . . .	973

# Table of Problems

<b>Chapter 1 • Introduction to Tort Law</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Hot Coffee and Culpability Problems .....	15
The Willful Misconduct Problem .....	16
The Actual McDonald's Negligence Case .....	18
The No-Fault (Strict Liability) Problem .....	27
<b>Chapter 2 • Negligence Law: Breach of Duty</b> .....	<b>51</b>
Emergency Problem .....	80
Superior Skill Problem .....	91
The Missing Rearview Mirror Problem .....	105
The Dangerous Bus Stop Problem .....	106
The Careless Driver Problem .....	117
The Headlights Problem .....	139
Childproof Cap Problem .....	145
Keys in Ignition Problem .....	145
The Falling Steer Problem .....	163
The Rolling Car Problem .....	164
Medical Malpractice Problem .....	180
The Glass Patio Door Problem .....	187
Electroshock Therapy Problem .....	189
<b>Chapter 3 • Duty</b> .....	<b>191</b>
Texting While Driving Problem .....	207
Restatement (Third) Problem .....	227
Ice Caves Mountain Problem .....	228
Duty to Act Reform Statute Drafting Problem .....	243
The Designated Driver Problem .....	278
Who Shot Arnold Schuster? Problem .....	279
The Involuntary Police Decoy Problem .....	279
Fear Resulting from Misdiagnosis Problem .....	316

Fertility Problem . . . . .	317
Pumping Gas to Drunks Problem . . . . .	350
Physician Liability to Third Parties Problem . . . . .	351
Criminal Attack on Delivery Person Problem. . . . .	352
The Fierce Doberman Problem. . . . .	353
<b>Chapter 4 • Causation . . . . .</b>	<b>355</b>
Bad Brakes Problem . . . . .	395
Gallstone Diagnosis Problem . . . . .	396
Candlewatt Power Problem. . . . .	396
Burned Sewer Line Problem . . . . .	436
<b>Chapter 5 • Scope of Liability (Proximate Cause). . . . .</b>	<b>439</b>
Peripatetic Rat Problem . . . . .	460
Legal Advocacy Problem . . . . .	496
Oil Spill Tragedy Problem . . . . .	499
Cat in the Hat Disaster. . . . .	499
Exam Drafting Problem . . . . .	500
<b>Chapter 6 • Damages. . . . .</b>	<b>503</b>
Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children . . . . .	530
Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem . . . . .	560
Cohabitation Wrongful Death Reform Problem. . . . .	564
Consortium Rights of Children Problem . . . . .	564
<b>Chapter 7 • Defenses and Immunities. . . . .</b>	<b>585</b>
Whitewater Trip Waiver Problem. . . . .	605
The Ultralight Aircraft Problem. . . . .	626
The Flopper Problem . . . . .	626
Comparative Fault Problems — Simple Two Party Cases . . . . .	629
Set-Off . . . . .	631
Comparative Fault Problems — Multiple Problems and Multiple Claims . . . . .	631
The Changing Law Problem . . . . .	647
Discretionary Function Problems . . . . .	662
<b>Chapter 8 • Intentional Torts . . . . .</b>	<b>665</b>
Battery Problems . . . . .	691
Assault Problems . . . . .	694
Short Practice Problems on Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress . . . . .	719

The Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem . . . . .	721
False Imprisonment Problems . . . . .	728
Conversion Problem . . . . .	735
Cyberspace Problem . . . . .	738
Consent Problems . . . . .	749
Self-Defense and Defense of Others Problems . . . . .	758
Intentional Tort Review Problems 1–3 . . . . .	771
I. Short Review Problems . . . . .	771
II. Sample Exam & Review Problem — University Mascot Problem . . . . .	772
Spousal Abuse Problem . . . . .	774
<b>Chapter 9 • Trespass to Land, Nuisance, and Abnormally</b>	
<b>Dangerous Activities . . . . .</b>	<b>781</b>
Trespass to Land: Short Problems . . . . .	785
Transporting Gasoline Problem . . . . .	833
<b>Chapter 10 • Products Liability . . . . .</b>	<b>835</b>
Problem: Who Is a Seller in Strict Liability? . . . . .	854
Design Defectiveness Problems . . . . .	907
The Bullet Proof Vest Problem . . . . .	907
Car Roof Stability in Rollover Problem . . . . .	908
Ladder State of the Art Problem . . . . .	908
Hot Water Heater Design Defect Problem . . . . .	908
Drawstring Sweatshirt Problem . . . . .	950
Household Cleaner Injury Problem . . . . .	951
Folding Chair Problem . . . . .	952
Scented Candle Problem . . . . .	952
Baby Cushion Problem . . . . .	952





# Diversity and Inclusion Materials

## Incorporating Diversity and Inclusion in Teaching Torts

We believe we should constantly work to make ourselves more adept at understanding how race, ethnicity, national origin or citizenship, gender, religious affiliation or background, sexual orientation, gender identity, economic class or status, political affiliation or belief, veteran status, and ability or disability affect the way we live and learn, so that we are better able to respond to intolerance and prejudice, which violate our purpose and mission.<sup>1</sup>

American institutions of higher education emphasize diversity and inclusion as essential to the success of their mission. Many have hired professionals, created units, or established faculty committees charged with promoting diversity and inclusion. Students and employers have often been at the forefront of these efforts to ensure that students receive training that would make them culturally aware and competent. Impetus in this direction has also come from greater awareness of the resilience of social discrimination and intolerance. It is also the case that increased information about sexual harassment and the obligations imposed by Title IX have pushed academic institutions to respond proactively to barriers faced by women in higher education. Many law schools have embraced the challenge of graduating future lawyers who are prepared to succeed in an increasingly diverse profession. They accept that they have unique contributions to make towards promoting diversity and inclusion and they have moved to improve their curriculum offering and develop skills training consistent with this mission. Today, many law schools are going beyond occasional lectures and elective seminars and are encouraging faculty to design core courses to highlight issues of diversity and inclusion. The American Bar Association created a Center for Diversity and Inclusion in the Profession in 2018 in support of its commitment to promote full and equal participation and eliminate bias in the legal profession and the justice system. Undoubtedly, the efforts to mainstream issues of diversity and inclusion will grow.

---

1. From Mission Statement of the University of Oregon Division of Equity and Inclusion.

A course in tort law provides many opportunities to discuss, consider and include the diversity of our communities. In almost every chapter of this casebook, there are cases, notes, and problems that would assist any teacher who is inclined to engage students in a robust conversation about diversity and inclusion matters, generally, and as they relate to tort law. This is the result of a commitment by the authors to make such concerns critical components of the first-year learning process, a commitment that was present from the very first edition of this casebook. The authors have outlined below how they have employed the materials to teach negligence, intentional torts, and products liability with a clear appreciation of how issues of diversity and inclusion have been addressed, ignored, or dismissed by the civil justice system. An index on diversity and inclusion has also been created to further assist faculty and students in identifying areas and problems that they may want to examine.

The introductory materials in **Chapter One** explicitly point to the substantial individual and social cost of accidental injury and deaths and the important role tort compensation plays in making victims whole again. Of particular focus is the availability and affordability of insurance for particular social groups. The text notes that children in poverty and minority individuals are found in disproportionate numbers among the uninsured. Someone has to pay the cost of injuries and deaths. The McDonald's coffee case and the various hypotheticals based on it could be used to signal how gender and age considerations influence not only litigation but also public perception of who or what deserves compensation. The brief introduction in the chapter to personal injury damages also provides an initial opportunity to presage the fuller discussion in Chapter Six of race, gender, class and other considerations relating to diversity and inclusion.

The **Breach of Duty** chapter provides opportunities to engage the students on some critical diversity and inclusion issues. In the cases and notes dealing with the child standard of care and treatment of people with intellectual disability or mental illness, the discussion is front and center. A more searching conversation could be built around the value of adopting a "reasonable woman" standard for some cases or the gender discrimination implicit in some applications of Judge Hand's risk calculus. *McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc.*, is an effective vehicle for bringing out some of these gender discrimination issues while the *Dangerous Bus Stop* problem casts a bright light on race and class discrimination.

Perhaps more than any other element of the negligence scheme, duty demands appreciation of the struggle to expand the reach of legal protection in tort law to disfavored or marginalized groups. Without delving extensively into the dispute over whether negligence was designed to favor certain class interests, the **Duty** chapter provides diverse opportunities for examining historical and contemporary diversity and inclusion matters. The *Ruvalcaba* case, for example, is an invaluable tool in generating discussions about problematic applications of the status trichotomy rules and the potential for bias founded implicitly upon ethnicity, race, and class considerations. The sections dealing with limited duties to assist or rescue, to take protective measures against risks posed by third parties, and to protect against criminal

conduct, are replete with examples of how gender, age, and intellectual disability may not receive appropriate consideration in the development of duty doctrines and in their applications. Concepts such as special relationship, identifiable victim, or the prior similar incidents test are fraught with value judgments about what interests are worthy of protection under some circumstances. For better or for worse, duty is the fulcrum around which we make the first cut in the negligence scheme. The notes in the public duty doctrine section are striking in terms of how duty concepts are deployed in evaluating institutional responses to gender violence. The centrality of gender may also be seen in the development of judicial approaches to negligent infliction of emotional distress cases. From the cold calculus of *Mitchell v. Rochester* to the invitation to the absurd represented by the *Burgess, Huggins*, and *Boyles* group of cases, the stage is set for a thorough investigation into how the duty concept struggles to incorporate diverse experiences and interests.

The **Causation** chapter provides multiple opportunities for raising diversity and inclusion concerns. One such opportunity comes in examining how Judge Calabresi analyzed cause in fact concerns in the *Zuchowicz* and *Williams* cases where defendants' breach of duty was clear and arguably deprived plaintiffs of the opportunity to prove causal responsibility. *Williams* extends the discussion to the responsibility of educational institutions or landlords more broadly to protect students or tenants from criminals. The market share cases dealing with DES and lead paint also provide direct and urgent avenues for confronting gender, age and class implications of the causation doctrine.

In the **Scope of Liability** chapter, the exceptions to the foresight rule suggest opportunities for bringing up diversity and inclusion matters: the intersection of the thin-skulled plaintiff rule and mental distress, the gendered application of the rescuer doctrine, and the abject treatment of suicide.

Perhaps more so than the elements dealing with liability in negligence, the calculation of *damages* raises serious concerns about how the marginalization of minorities and disfavored groups are reinforced by the civil justice system. As a result, the casebook devotes a substantial portion of the chapter on **damages** to an explicit consideration of such matters in **section 6.04, "race, ethnicity, gender, cohabitation, and class fairness in tort."** However, even the cases outside of that section raise significant issues relating to diversity and inclusion. Some highlights of the damages chapter include the *Calva-Cerqueira* case with its comprehensive analysis of personal injury damages and the inevitable explicit and implicit class, race, and gender assumptions about the value of one's life especially post-accident. Life expectancy, work-life expectancy, the valuation of pain and suffering, compensation for loss of enjoyment of life, the history behind wrongful death claims and the current interpretations of statutes authorizing such actions, and statutorily imposed limits on recovery for non-material losses, all provide further instances for critical considerations of why diversity and inclusion are important values within our profession and the justice system.

In the chapter on **Defenses and Immunities**, affirmative defenses such as contributory negligence, assumption of risk, immunities, and statutes of limitations

provide valuable windows into how the negligence system reflects power differentials in society. The *Wassell* case, in particular, could motivate a robust discussion of how women's experiences and interests are valued within a seemingly dispassionate process of assessing comparative responsibilities.

Some colleagues have chosen to begin their course with the materials in the chapter on **Intentional Torts** precisely because they allow for a more explicit discussion of how the civil justice system treats the most vulnerable members of society. Almost every case in the chapter allows for an enriching conversation about power differential in private and public lives and how the tort system disciplines intentional conduct. The collection of cases that are offered to examine intentional infliction of emotional distress, from *Brandon* to *Alcorn*, *Swenson*, and *Graham*, is instructive. Beyond those, the *Reavis* case and the notes stand out for this section's sophisticated consideration of the abuse of women in the workplace, and *Wal-Mart Stores* allows for discussion of how minority experiences are policed in the consumer sector.

The text is by no means comprehensive but we believe that it makes an important contribution to the field and the context in which it must be taught. We are grateful for any suggestions for improvement.

## Index of Diversity and Inclusion Materials

### I. FAIRNESS (DISCRIMINATION) IN TORT LAW

#### Age (Elderly)

§ 8.03 (676–678, 682–684)

§ 7.02[B] (600)

§ 7.03[B] (619)

#### Children

§ 2.04[F] (86–91)

Dangerous Bus Stop Problem (Chapter 2, 106)

§ 2.05 (106–108)

Childproof Cap Problem (Chapter 2, 145)

§ 3.01 (203–204)

§ 3.02[A] (208–217)

§ 3.02[B] (231–232, 258–260)

§ 3.02[C] (285–291)

§ 3.02[C] (303–307, 318–328, 331–334)

§ 5.01[B] (442–443)

§ 5.02[C][2] (467–472)

§ 5.03[A] (479–482)

Legal Advocacy Problem § 5.04[B] (Chapter 5, 496–499)

Cat in the Hat Disaster § 5.05 (Chapter 5, 499–500)

§ 7.02[A] (592–593)

§ 7.02[B] (600–602)

§ 7.03[A] (604)

§ 7.05 (642, 643)

The Changing Law Problem § 7.07 (Chapter 7, 647–648)

§ 7.08 (648–654)

§ 8.09[D] (764–765)

§ 10.02[B][2][a] (871–872 at n.4b)

§ 10.02[B][2][a] (917–924)

#### **Class Status**

§ 4.01[A] (357–358)

§ 4.01[C][2] (370–386)

§ 4.04[B][2] (431–436)

§ 7.02[B] (593–598)

§ 7.09 (660)

§ 8.08 (730–738)

§ 8.09 (760–764)

#### **Cohabitant Status**

§ 3.02[C] (293–294)

### **Damages — See below: II. FAIRNESS (DISCRIMINATION) IN TORT DAMAGES**

#### **Ethnicity**

Dangerous Bus Stop Problem (Chapter 2, 106)

§ 4.04[B][2] (431–436)

§ 8.03 (678–687)

§ 8.05 (709–711, 713–719)

§ 8.07 (722–729)

§ 8.08 (735–737)

§ 8.09[B] (753–758)

University Mascot Problem (Chapter 8, 772–774)

§ 10.02[B][2][a] (917–924)

§ 10.02[B][3][c] (933 at n.5)

**Gender**

- § 2.04[B] (74–76)
- § 3.02[B] (239–240, 244–250, 254–255, 260–265, 275–278)
- § 3.02[B] Involuntary Decoy Problem (279–280)
- § 3.02[C] (283\_284)
- § 3.02[C] (298–303, 307–311, 317–328)
- § 3.02[C] Fear Resulting from Misdiagnosis Problem (316–317)
- § 4.01[C][2] (370–386)
- § 4.03 (408–419)
- § 4.04[B][1] (422–443)
- § 7.02[B] (593–602)
- § 7.07 (646–648)
- The Changing Law Problem § 7.07 (Chapter 7, 647–648)
- § 8.02 (665–676)
- § 8.03 (676–678, 682–684)
- § 8.03 (684–687)
- § 8.03 (690–691)
- § 8.05 (711–713, 715–717)
- Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem (Chapter 8, 721–722)
- § 8.08 (735–737)
- § 8.09[B] (751–753, 756–758)
- University Mascot Problem (Chapter 8, 772–774)
- Spousal Abuse Problem (Chapter 8, 774–779)
- § 10.02[B][3][c] (933 at n.5)

**Gender Identity (Transgender)**

- § 8.05 (698–708)

**LGBTQ**

- § 3.02[C] (294, 330–331)
- Destroyed Wedding Cake Problem (Chapter 8, 721–722)

**Mental Capacity Differences (Disabilities)**

- § 2.04[E] (82–86)
- § 5.01 (480)

§ 5.03[A] (479–482)

§ 5.03[B] (486–487)

§ 5.03[C] (490–492)

Discretionary Function Problems § 7.09 (Chapter 7, 663 probs. (e–f))

§ 8.03 (676–678, 682–684)

### **Physical Capacity Differences (Disabilities)**

§ 2.04[D] (81)

§ 5.01 (440)

§ 5.02[B] (456–459)

§ 5.03[A] (479–482)

§ 5.03[B] (483–486)

Cat in the Hat Disaster § 5.05 (Chapter 5, 499–500)

§ 7.02[B] (600)

§ 7.03[B] (619)

§ 7.05 (635–642)

### **Race**

Dangerous Bus Stop Problem (Chapter 2, 106)

§ 4.04[B][2] (431–436)

§ 8.03 (678–687)

§ 8.05 (709–711, 713–719)

§ 8.07 (722–729)

§ 8.08 (735–737)

§ 8.09[A] (739–740, 742–749)

§ 8.09[B] (753–758)

University Mascot Problem (Chapter 8, 721–722)

### **Religion**

University Mascot Problem (Chapter 8, 721–722)

### **Tort Damages Generally**

§ 6.04 (530–563)

See Fairness in Tort Damages below

### **Women (See Gender)**



**II. FAIRNESS (DISCRIMINATION) IN TORT DAMAGES****Generally**

§ 6.04 (530–563)

**Children**

§ 6.04[A] Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children (530–531)

§ 6.04[F] Race, Ethnicity, & Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem (560)

§ 6.04[A] (530–531)

**Class**

§ 2.04 (76)

§ 6.06 (564–565)

§ 7.02[B] (593–598)

**Cohabitation Status**

§ 6.05 (560–564)

§ 6.05 Cohabitation Wrongful Death Reform Problem (564)

§ 6.05 Consortium Rights of Children Problem (564)

**Ethnicity**

§ 1.07 (32 at n.8)

§ 6.01 (506–517)

§ 6.04[A] Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children (530–531)

§ 6.04[F] Race, Ethnicity, & Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem (560)

**Gender**

§ 1.07 (32 at n.8)

§ 6.04[A] Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children (530–531)

§ 6.04[F] Race, Ethnicity, & Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem (560)

§ 6.05[B] (547–560)

§ 7.02[B] (593–602)

**LGBTQ**

§ 6.04 (533–535)

**Race**

§ 1.07 (32 at n. 8)

§ 2.04 (76)

§ 6.04[A] Fairness Problems in Determining Future Earnings Losses of Young Children (530–531)

§ 6.04[F] Race, Ethnicity, & Gender Fairness in Tort Damages Problem (560)

§ 6.04[C] (533–535)

**Sexuality**

§ 6.04 (533–535)

**Women (See Gender)**

§ 1.07 (32 at n. 8)

Medical Malpractice Problem (Chapter 2, 180–181)

