

ASPEN CASEBOOK SERIES

*HENDERSON  
TWERSKI  
KYSAR*

**PRODUCTS LIABILITY**  
**Problems and Process**

*Eighth  
Edition*



Wolters Kluwer

Aspen Casebook Series

---

# PRODUCTS LIABILITY

## Problems and Process Eighth Edition

---

**James A. Henderson, Jr.**

Frank B. Ingersoll Professor of Law  
Cornell Law School

**Aaron D. Twerski**

Irwin and Jill Cohen Professor of Law  
Brooklyn Law School

**Douglas A. Kysar**

Joseph M. Field '55 Professor of Law  
Yale Law School



Wolters Kluwer

Copyright © 2016 James A. Henderson, Aaron D. Twerski and Douglas A. Kysar

Published by Wolters Kluwer in New York.

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S. serves customers worldwide with CCH, Aspen Publishers, and Kluwer Law International products. ([www.WKLegaledu.com](http://www.WKLegaledu.com))

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or utilized by any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher. For information about permissions or to request permissions online, visit us at [www.WKLegaledu.com](http://www.WKLegaledu.com), or a written request may be faxed to our permissions department at 212-771-0803.

To contact Customer Service, e-mail [customer.service@wolterskluwer.com](mailto:customer.service@wolterskluwer.com), call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to:

Wolters Kluwer  
Attn: Order Department  
PO Box 990  
Frederick, MD 21705

Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

ISBN 978-1-4548-7086-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Henderson, James A., 1938- author. | Twerski, Aaron D., author. | Kysar, Douglas A., author.

Title: Products liability : problems and process / James A. Henderson, Jr., Aaron D. Twerski, Douglas A. Kysar.

Description: Eighth edition. | New York : Wolters Kluwer, 2016. | Includes index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015044272 | ISBN 9781454870869

Subjects: LCSH: Products liability—United States.

Classification: LCC KF1296 .H43 2016 | DDC 346.7303/8—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015044272>

# PRODUCTS LIABILITY

## **EDITORIAL ADVISORS**

### **Erwin Chemerinsky**

Dean and Distinguished Professor of Law  
Raymond Pryke Professor of First Amendment Law  
University of California, Irvine, School of Law

### **Richard A. Epstein**

Laurence A. Tisch Professor of Law  
New York University School of Law  
Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow  
The Hoover Institution  
Senior Lecturer in Law  
The University of Chicago

### **Ronald J. Gilson**

Charles J. Meyers Professor of Law and Business  
Stanford University  
Marc and Eva Stern Professor of Law and Business  
Columbia Law School

### **James E. Krier**

Earl Warren DeLano Professor of Law  
The University of Michigan Law School

### **Richard K. Neumann, Jr.**

Professor of Law  
Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University

### **Robert H. Sitkoff**

John L. Gray Professor of Law  
Harvard Law School

### **David Alan Sklansky**

Stanley Morrison Professor of Law  
Stanford Law School  
Faculty Co-Director  
Stanford Criminal Justice Center

---

## **About Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S.**

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S. delivers expert content and solutions in the areas of law, corporate compliance, health compliance, reimbursement, and legal education. Its practical solutions help customers successfully navigate the demands of a changing environment to drive their daily activities, enhance decision quality and inspire confident outcomes.

Serving customers worldwide, its legal and regulatory solutions portfolio includes products under the Aspen Publishers, CCH Incorporated, Kluwer Law International, ftwilliam.com and MediRegs names. They are regarded as exceptional and trusted resources for general legal and practice-specific knowledge, compliance and risk management, dynamic workflow solutions, and expert commentary.

---

From Jim  
To  
Marcie

From Aaron  
To  
Kreindel

From Doug  
To  
Christine

---

---

# Preface to the Eighth Edition

---

---

The Eighth Edition of *Products Liability: Problems and Process* represents a substantial revision of prior iterations of the casebook. In addition to updating the book to reflect new cases, commentary, and problems, we have also significantly shortened and reorganized the material in order to make the book more user-friendly.

We have been aided in this process by Doug Kysar, who joins as a new co-author for this Edition. Doug brings additional perspective to the subject of products liability, which all three authors continue to regard as a fascinating, challenging, and important field of law. We hope that our enthusiasm comes through to the reader.

*James A. Henderson, Jr.*  
*Aaron D. Twerski*  
*Douglas A. Kysar*

October 2015



---

---

# Acknowledgments

---

---

The authors wish to thank Beth Pollastro, at Brooklyn, and Jennifer Marshall, at Yale, who helped to prepare this edition of the casebook. Jylanda Diles, at Cornell, and Golda Lawrence, at Brooklyn, provided terrific assistance with prior editions. We are grateful to them all.

Research assistants provided invaluable help in assembling these materials. John Baumann (Cornell '86), Jay Bohn (Cornell '88), and Grace Lee (Brooklyn '87) helped us on the first edition. On the second edition, Ron Jenkins and David Ludwick (Cornell '93), Claire Kelly (Brooklyn '93), and Marni Schlissel (Brooklyn '92) provided invaluable assistance. On the third edition, Jordan Anger (Cornell '98), Hanna Liebman (Brooklyn '98), Allison Sealove (Brooklyn '97), and Victoria Ostrovsky (Brooklyn '97) were all of great help to us. On the fourth edition, Thomas Ciarlone (Cornell '01), Jesse Eggert (Cornell '01), Debbie Sternberg Tyler (Brooklyn '00), Kim Houghton (Brooklyn '01), and Michael Heydrich (Brooklyn '00) helped us meet very tight deadlines. On the fifth edition, Mason Barney (Brooklyn '05), Erez Davy (Brooklyn '05), Jennifer Lee (Brooklyn '05), Daniel London (Brooklyn '05), Carl Berry (Cornell '05), and Katharine Burns (Cornell '05) helped us to complete a very substantial revision of these materials. On the sixth edition, Helder Agostinho (Cornell '09), Daniel Hendrick (Cornell '09), and Michael Siegel (Cornell '09) helped with the revisions. On the seventh edition, Colin Leslie (Cornell '11), Steve Beytenbrod (Brooklyn '11), John-Paul Gonzalez (Brooklyn), Elina Shindelman (Brooklyn '11), Sarah A. Westby (Brooklyn '11), Noor I. Alam (Brooklyn '12), Yonah Jaffe (Brooklyn '12), and Shimon Sternhell (Brooklyn '12), provided valuable research assistance. For the eighth edition, we were aided ably by David Berke (Yale '17), Juliana Brint (Yale '17), Christine Kwon (Yale '17), Andy Mun (Yale '17), Nathan Nash (Yale '17), Paul Nolle (Brooklyn '17), Loren Oumarova (Yale '17), Shahriar Raafi (Brooklyn '17), Joey Samuels (Yale '17), Amanda Weingarten (Yale '16), David Weisner (Brooklyn '17), and Grace Zhang (Yale '16). We are grateful to them for their contributions.

Deans Peñalver at Cornell, Allard at Brooklyn, and Post at Yale also deserve thanks for their generous support.

We would like to thank the authors and publishers of the following works for permitting us to include excerpts from these works:

American Law Institute, Restatement of Torts (Second), §310, §311, §402A, and Comments *b*, *f*, *i*, *k*, and *n*; and §402B. Copyright © 1965, 1977 by The American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

American Law Institute, Restatement of Torts (Third): Apportionment of Liability §22, §23. Reporters Note to §7, §32. Copyright © 2000 by The American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission. U.C.C. §2-302 and Comment 1; §2-313 and Comments 3 and 8; §2-316 and Comment 1; §2-719 and Comment 3; §2-725. Copyright © 1995 by the American Law Institute and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act,

- 1995 and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform States Laws. Reprinted with permission.
- American Law Institute, Restatement of Torts (Third): Products Liability, §1, §2, and Comments *c, d, e, f, g, i, j, k, m, and n*; §3 and Comment *b*; §4 and Comments *d, and e*; §5 and Comment *b*; §6 and Comments *b, d, e, f, and h*; §7 and Comments *a and b*; §8, §9, and Comments *a and b*; §10 and Comments *a and j*; §15, §16, §17, §18, §19, §20, §21, and Comment *e*. Copyright © 1998 by The American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.
- Henderson & Twerski, Manufacturer's Liability for Defective Product Designs: The Triumph of Risk Utility, 74 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1061, 1077-1099 (2009). Copyright © 2009 by The Brooklyn Law Review. Reprinted by permission of the authors, The Brooklyn Law Review.
- Henderson & Twerski, Drug Designs Are Different. Copyright © 2001 by The Yale Law Journal Company, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the authors, The Yale Law Journal Company, and Fred B. Rothman & Company from The Yale Law Journal, vol. 111, No. 1, pages 151-153, 155-159, 162-164, 168-169, 171-172, 180-181.
- Henderson & Twerski, Closing the American Products Liability Frontier: The Rejection of Liability Without Defect, 66 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1263, 1298-1300, 1305-1306, 1316-1318. Copyright © 1991 by the New York University Law Review. Reprinted by permission of the New York University Law Review.
- Henderson & Twerski, Doctrinal Collapse in Products Liability: The Empty Shell of Failure to Warn, 65 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 265, 292-294. Copyright © 1990 by the New York University Law Review. Reprinted by permission of the New York University Law Review.
- Posner, A Theory of Negligence, 1 J. Legal Stud. 29, 32. Copyright © 1972 by the University of Chicago. Reprinted with permission of the author and the publisher.
- Ramseyer, Liability For Defective Products: Comparative Hypotheses And Evidence From Japan, 61 Am. J. Comp. L. 617 (2013).
- Reimann, Liability for Defective Products at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century: Emergence of a Worldwide Standard?, 51 Am. J. Comp. L. 751 (Fall 2003)
- Uniform Law Commission, Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act. Copyright © 1939 and 1955 by The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. All Rights Reserved.
- Wertheimer, The Smoke Gets in Their Eyes: Product Category Liability and Alternative Feasible Designs in the Third Restatement, 61 Tenn. L. Rev. 1429. Copyright © 1994 by The Tennessee Law Review Association, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the Tennessee Law Review Association, Inc.
- Wolfram, Modern Legal Ethics 594-596, 653-657. Copyright © 1986 by West Publishing Co. Reprinted with permission of the author and the West Group.

# PRODUCTS LIABILITY

---

---

# Summary of Contents

---

---

Contents		xi
Preface to the Eighth Edition		xix
Acknowledgments		xxi
PART I		
Liability for Manufacturing Defects		1
Chapter One	Product Distributor's Strict Liability for Defect-Caused Harm	3
Chapter Two	Causation	85
Chapter Three	Affirmative Defenses	123
PART II		
Liability for Generic Product Risks		155
Chapter Four	Liability for Defective Design	157
Chapter Five	Liability for Failure to Warn	309
Chapter Six	Express Warranty and Misrepresentation	391
PART III		
Special Problem Areas		417
Chapter Seven	Special Products and Product Markets	419
Chapter Eight	Special Elements of the Products Liability Plaintiff's Recovery	475
Chapter Nine	Products Liability in a Global Context	535
Table of Cases		573
Table of Statutes and Other Authorities		587
Index		593

---



---

# Contents

---



---

Preface to the Eighth Edition	xix
Acknowledgements	xxi

## PART I

### Liability for Manufacturing Defects

---



---

CHAPTER ONE	Product Distributor's Strict Liability for Defect-Caused Harm	3
A.	The Role of Negligence in the Formative Period	4
1.	Negligence from First-Year Torts	4
2.	The Fall of the Privity Rule	6
3.	The Rise of Res Ipsa Loquitur	8
	<i>Escola v. Coca-Cola Bottling Co.</i>	9
B.	The Modern Rule of Strict Liability in Tort	13
1.	Implied Warranty as a Bridge to Strict Liability in the 1950s and Early 1960s	14
2.	Adoption of §402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts in 1965	16
3.	Codification of the Strict Liability Rule in the Restatement (Third) of Torts in 1998	17
	Problem One	18
4.	Policy Objectives Supporting Strict Liability in Tort	19
	Problem Two	20
C.	Defect as the Linchpin of Strict Products Liability	22
1.	What Makes a Product Defective? (The Conceptual Dimension)	22
	<i>Cronin v. J. B. E. Olson Corp.</i>	22
2.	How Does the Plaintiff Prove Original Defect? (The Practical Dimension)	26
	<i>Speller v. Sears, Roebuck &amp; Co.</i>	28
	Problem Three	33
D.	The Boundaries of Strict Products Liability	33
1.	What Are (and What Are Not) Products?	34
	<i>Winter v. G. P. Putnam's Sons</i>	36
	Problem Four	40
	Postscript on Blood and Other Human Tissue	41
2.	Which Activities Constitute "Selling or Otherwise Distributing" in a Commercial Context?	42
	<i>Magrine v. Krasnica</i>	45
3.	When Is a Product Seller or Other Distributor "In the Business of Selling or Distributing"?	50

E. Allocating Responsibility Inside and Outside the Commercial Chain of Distribution	52
1. Allocating Responsibility Between Product Distributors and Other Defendants and Among Members of the Distributive Chain	52
a. Joint and Several Liability	52
b. Letting Retailers and Wholesalers Out of the Litigation Problem Five	56
c. Contribution Among Members of the Distributive Chain	59
d. Indemnity Rights Up the Distributive Chain	60
e. Settlement and Release Between the Plaintiff and Members of the Distributive Chain	62
F. Assigning Responsibility Collectively to the Distributive Chain	64
G. Assigning Responsibility for Product-Related Workplace Accidents	65
1. Direct Attack by the Employee Against the Employer	68
<i>Laidlow v. Hariton Machinery Co.</i>	69
2. Allocating Responsibility Between the Worker Compensation System and the Products Liability System	70
<i>Kotecki v. Cyclops Welding Corp.</i>	77
CHAPTER TWO Causation	77
A. Did the Product Actually Cause the Plaintiff's Harm?	85
1. But-For Causation in General	86
2. Special Problems of Proof: Reliance on Experts	87
<i>Rider v. Sandoz Pharmaceutical Corp.</i>	89
<i>Milward v. Acuity Specialty Products Group, Inc.</i>	96
Problem Six	103
B. Did the Defendant Supply the Product?	104
Problem Seven	108
C. Did the Defect in the Defendant's Product Contribute to Harming the Plaintiff?	109
1. The Traditional Burden In Proving Causation	109
<i>Midwestern V.W. Corp. v. Ringley</i>	109
Problem Eight	112
2. Enhanced Injury	113
3. Loss-of-a-Chance	113
Problem Nine	115
D. Did the Defective Product Proximately Cause the Plaintiff's Harm?	115
<i>Union Pump Co. v. Allbritton</i>	115
Problem Ten	121
Problem Eleven	121
CHAPTER THREE Affirmative Defenses	123
A. Conduct-Based Defenses: Background Principles	123
1. Introduction	123
2. Contributory Negligence	124

3. Comparative Fault	124
B. Application of Comparative Fault in Products Liability	125
1. Can Fault and Defect Be Compared?	126
a. Manufacturing Defects: Comparing Apples and Oranges	126
b. Generic Defects: Comparing Fault Under Risk-Utility Balancing	127
c. Should Fault and Defect Be Compared?	127
<i>Webb v. Navistar International Transportation Corp.</i>	127
Social Control of Product-Related Accidents:	
The Seat Belt Defense and Governmental Control of Drivers' Behavior	135
d. The Crashworthiness Imbroglio: Should Fault Be Compared with Enhanced Injury	136
<i>Wolf v. Toyota Motor Corporation</i>	136
e. Should Plaintiff's Fault Be Compared with Defendant's Breach of Express or Implied Warranty?	140
f. No Duty/Primary Assumption of Risk: Reintroducing Plaintiff's Conduct as a Total Bar	141
<i>Green v. Allendale Planting Co. &amp; the KBH Corp.</i>	142
Problem Twelve	148
g. Is Comparative Fault a Defense that Only Defendants Can Raise, or Can Plaintiffs Use It as an Affirmative Gambit?	149
C. Non-Conduct-Based Defenses	150
1. Time-Based Defenses	150
a. Open-Ended Time Bars	150
b. Fixed-Period Time Bars	150
Problem Thirteen	152
Note: Constitutionality of Statutes of Repose	153

## PART II

Liability for Generic Product Risks	155
-------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER FOUR	Liability for Defective Design	157
A. Preliminary Puzzlements		159
1. Do We Need Governmental Review of Product Designs? Why Not Leave Responsibility for Design Safety Entirely to the Market?		159
2. If We Need Governmental Review of Product Designs, Why Not Rely Exclusively on Nonjudicial Regulatory Agencies? Why Rely on Tort?		161
3. If We Must Rely on the Tort System, Why Limit Liability to Defect-Caused Harm? Why Not Adopt Broad-Based Enterprise Liability?		162
B. When the Fact of the Accident Speaks For Itself — Inferring Defect From Product Malfunction		163

C. Risk-Utility: The Reasonable Alternative Design Standard For Determining Design Defect	165
1. Defining the Standard for Determining Design Defect	166
<i>Smith v. Louisville Ladder Co.</i>	166
<i>Bourne v. Marty Gilman, Inc.</i>	175
Problem Fourteen	181
Problem Fifteen	184
2. The Time Dimension: Post-Distribution Increases in Knowledge of Risks	185
3. The Time Dimension: Post-Distribution Improvements in Risk-Avoidance Techniques	187
a. State of the Art	187
<i>Boatland of Houston, Inc. v. Bailey</i>	187
b. Admissibility of Evidence of Subsequent Remedial Measures	194
4. How Do Negligence and Strict Liability Theories Differ? Should Design Claims Be Submitted to Juries on Both Theories?	198
<i>Lecy v. Bayliner Marine Corp.</i>	199
5. Can a Warning Substitute for a Reasonable Alternative Design?	204
<i>Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co. v. Martinez</i>	205
D. Risk-Utility: Product Category Liability	210
James A. Henderson, Jr. & Aaron D. Twerski, Closing the American Products Liability Frontier: The Rejection of Liability Without Defect	214
Ellen Wertheimer, The Smoke Gets in Their Eyes: Product Category Liability and Alternative Feasible Designs in the Third Restatement	216
<i>Parish v. Jumpking, Inc.</i>	219
<i>Dawson v. Chrysler Corp.</i>	222
Note: Crashworthiness Litigation	230
E. The Consumer Expectations Standard For Determining Design Defect	234
1. Consumer Expectations as a Sword to Impose Liability	235
<i>Heaton v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	235
<i>Potter v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co.</i>	239
Problem Sixteen	247
The Uniform Commercial Code and the Consumer Expectations Test	248
2. Consumer Expectations as a Shield Against Liability	249
F. The Two-Prong Standard For Determining Design Defect	252
<i>Soule v. General Motors Corp.</i>	252
<i>Mikolajczyk v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	265
Problem Seventeen	270
G. Special Duty Problems in Design Litigation	270
1. Whether and to What Extent Should Courts Explicitly Defer to Markets on a Case-by-Case Basis?	270
<i>Linegar v. Armour of America, Inc.</i>	270
<i>Scarangella v. Thomas Built Buses, Inc.</i>	273
2. Whether and to What Extent Should Courts Defer to Safety Statutes or Administrative Regulations?	279



3. Beyond the Pale: High Profile No-Duty Cases	282
<i>Hamilton v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i>	283
<i>In re September 11 Litigation</i>	286
H. Special Problems of Misuse, Alteration, and Modification	288
I. Federal Preemption of Design Defect Claims	294
<i>Mutual Pharmaceutical Co., Inc. v. Bartlett</i>	298
 CHAPTER FIVE      Liability for Failure to Warn	 309
A. The Basic Duty to Warn at Time of Sale	310
1. The General Rule Governing Failure to Warn	311
<i>Olson v. Prosoco, Inc.</i>	312
2. No Duty to Warn of Unknowable Risks	314
Liability Insurance and Long-Tail, Unknowable Risks	317
3. No Duty to Warn of Obvious or Generally Known Risks	318
<i>Jamieson v. Woodward &amp; Lothrop</i>	318
<i>Greene v. A.P. Products, Ltd.</i>	322
Problem Eighteen	329
To Speak or Not To Speak; "Digging Your Own Grave With the Best of Intentions"	330
Problem Nineteen	331
4. Informed-Choice Warnings	331
Problem Twenty	334
<i>Liriano v. Hobart Corp.</i>	335
5. Who Must Warn Whom?	341
B. The Sufficiency of the Defendant's Warning	343
<i>Moore v. Ford Motor Company</i>	343
Problem Twenty-One	349
James A. Henderson, Jr. & Aaron D. Twerski, Doctrinal Collapse in Products Liability: The Empty Shell of Failure to Warn	351
<i>Broussard v. Continental Oil Co.</i>	353
C. Post-Sale Warnings	357
<i>Lovick v. Wil-Rich</i>	359
D. Special Problems With Causation	365
1. Would the Product User/Consumer Have Heeded an Adequate Warning?	365
2. If the User/Consumer Had Heeded the Warning, Would the Plaintiff's Harm Have Been Reduced/Avoided?	370
3. What If the Defendant's Failure to Warn Causes Plaintiff to Suffer Harm from Another Product?	371
<i>Powell v. Standard Brands Paint Co.</i>	371
4. Did the Plaintiff Suffer the Sort of Harm that an Adequate Warning Would Have Aimed at Preventing?	376
Problem Twenty-Two	377
E. Federal Preemption of Product Warning Claims	377
Note: FDA-Approved Warnings	381
<i>Wyeth v. Levine</i>	381