

CSICL

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Compensation for Personal Injury in English, German and Italian Law

A Comparative Outline



**BASIL MARKESINIS, MICHAEL COESTER,
GUIDO ALPA AND AUGUSTUS ULLSTEIN**

Compensation for Personal Injury in English, German and Italian Law

A Comparative Outline

Basil Markesinis, Michael Coester, Guido Alpa
and Augustus Ullstein



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Basil Markesinis, Michael Coester, Guido Alpa and Augustus Ullstein 2005

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2005

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Swift 10/13 pt System \TeX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 84613 7 hardback

Compensation for Personal Injury in English, German and Italian Law

Cross-border claims for personal injuries are becoming more common. Furthermore, European nationals increasingly join class actions in the USA. These tendencies have created a need to know more about the law of damages in Europe and America.

Despite the growing importance of this subject, there is a dearth of material available to practitioners to assist them in advising their clients as to the heads of damage recoverable in other countries. This book aims to fill that gap by looking at the law in England, Germany and Italy. It sets out the raw data in the wider context of tort law, then provides a closer synthesis, largely concerned with methodological issues, and draws some comparative conclusions.

BASIL MARKESINIS QC, FBA is Professor of Common and Civil Law at University College London and Jamail Regents Chair in Law at the University of Texas at Austin. He is the author or co-author of twenty-five books and over a hundred articles published in major European and US legal journals. He has received high decorations from the Presidents of France, Germany, Greece and Italy for his work on European law and European integration and is Corresponding Member of the Academies of Athens, Belgium, France and the Netherlands.

MICHAEL COESTER has been an Ordinarius Professor of Law at the University of Göttingen (1983–1994) and Munich since 1994. He was Dean of the faculty in Göttingen and has served on the Senate of the University of Munich. He has been Visiting Professor at the University of Michigan, University College London, and University of Nanjing. He has authored four books and over 130 articles published in journals of several countries, and is the co-author of two leading German commentaries on private and private international law.

GUIDO ALPA FBA is Professor of Civil Law at the University of Rome 'La Sapienza' and Professor of Anglo-American Law at the University of Genoa. He has been Vice President of the Italian Bar Council since 2001 and President of the Italian Bar Council since 2004. Professor Alpa has published books on civil law, financial markets contracts and regulation, consumer protection, tort liability and comparative law.

AUGUSTUS ULLSTEIN LL B. Q.C. is a barrister practising in London. He specialises in Personal Injuries and Product Liability cases arising from accidents occurring in England, Europe and the USA. He has given expert evidence in the USA on the English Law of damages in Personal Injury cases.

With a Foreword by the Rt Hon. the Lord Steyn.

Established in 1946, this series produces high quality scholarship in the fields of public and private international law and comparative law. Although these are distinct legal subdisciplines, developments since 1946 confirm their interrelation.

Comparative law is increasingly used as a tool in the making of law at national, regional, and international levels. Private international law is now often affected by international conventions, and the issues faced by classical conflicts rules are frequently dealt with by substantive harmonisation of law under international auspices. Mixed international arbitrations, especially those involving state economic activity, raise mixed questions of public and private international law, while in many fields (such as the protection of human rights and democratic standards, investment guarantees and international criminal law) international and national systems interact. National constitutional arrangements relating to "foreign affairs," and to the implementation of international norms, are a focus of attention.

The Board welcomes works of a theoretical or interdisciplinary character, and those focusing on the new approaches to international or comparative law or conflicts of law. Studies of particular institutions or problems are equally welcome, as are translations of the best work published in other languages.

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>General Editors</i> | James Crawford SC FBA
<i>Whewell Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, and
Director, Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law,
University of Cambridge</i>
John S. Bell FBA
<i>Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge</i> |
| <i>Editorial Board</i> | Professor Hilary Charlesworth <i>University of Adelaide</i>
Professor Lori Damrosch <i>Columbia University Law School</i>
Professor John Dugard <i>Universiteit Leiden</i>
Professor Mary-Ann Glendon <i>Harvard Law School</i>
Professor Christopher Greenwood <i>London School of Economics</i>
Professor David Johnston <i>University of Edinburgh</i>
Professor Hein Kötz <i>Max-Planck-Institut, Hamburg</i>
Professor Donald McRae <i>University of Ottawa</i>
Professor Onuma Yasuaki <i>University of Tokyo</i>
Professor Reinhard Zimmermann <i>Universität Regensburg</i> |
| <i>Advisory Committee</i> | Professor D.W. Bowett QC
Judge Rosalyn Higgins QC
Professor J.A. Jolowicz QC
Professor Sir Elihu Lauterpacht CBE QC
Professor Kurt Lipstein
Judge Stephen Schwebel |

(list continues at the end of the book)

Foreword

In 1871, when reviewing Addison's recently published *The Law of Torts*, Oliver Wendell Holmes expressed the view that 'Torts is not a proper subject for a law book' ((1871) 5 Am.L.R. 340). In 1881 Holmes gave the lie to this idea in his famous book *The Common Law* which contained a magisterial chapter on the theory of the law of torts. Today, tort law has a strong claim to have generated more case law and more literature than any other branch of the law.

In an age in which comparative law has come of age the development of our tort law has benefited greatly from comparative methods. It has enabled us to test our law against feasible solutions adopted in foreign legal systems. Due perhaps in large measure to the relative inaccessibility of sources in foreign languages, the comparative exercise has unfortunately in English legal practice largely concentrated on decisions in common law jurisdictions, such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. That our courts need not be so inhibited has been underlined, for example, by three major works, i.e. Prof. Christian von Bar, *The Common European Law of Torts*, vols. 1 and 2 (2000); Prof. Walter van Gerven (van Gerven, Lever and Larouche), *Cases, Materials and Text on National, Supranational and International Tort Law* (2000); Prof. Basil Markesinis and Prof. Hannes Unberath, *The German Law of Torts* (4th edn, 2002). All three are, of course, essential reading for practitioners. The decision of the House of Lords in *Fairchild v. Glenhaven Funeral Services* [2003] 1 AC 32, which concerned the age old tort problem of uncertainty about which employment caused a disease, has demonstrated what can be done, if the complex foreign material is 'packaged' in an attractive manner. The opinion of Lord Bingham of Cornhill (at 58 to 63 and 66) relied strongly on the rich sources of modern civilian practice and doctrine: see also the opinion of Lord Rodger of Earlsferry

(at 117 to 118). Practitioners need to take account of the important lesson of *Fairchild* that Continental jurisprudence really matters.

Now there is another great step forward with the publication of this book. The subject of compensation for personal injury is of great practical importance in all civil justice systems. The book compares the solutions adopted in English, German and Italian law. The aim is essentially practical, namely to make available to judges, practitioners and academic lawyers a detailed account of the decisions of foreign courts, packaged to meet the needs of practitioners, in order to enable the comparative point of view to play a dynamic role in the development of our law.

The book has been written by distinguished lawyers who share a profound knowledge of tort law and comparative methodology. Not surprisingly, they have produced a first class book which is a notable contribution to tort law and comparative law studies. It contains much material which those in practice cannot afford to ignore. I commend it unreservedly to judges, practitioners and academic lawyers.

JOHAN STEYN

House of Lords, June 2004

Preface

Biblical texts warn us that no one can serve two gods. Lawyers, no doubt, have occasionally done so; and comparative lawyers must, surely, have a dispensation to do so regularly. For the *raison d'être* of the latter is to describe and compare different systems without fear or favour, largely for the sake of the advantages and the insights that flow from any comparative exercise. We have thus tried to present in a comparative juxtaposition three major legal systems of the world and have addressed our text to two readerships which are often described as being very different – practitioners (including judges) and academics. We have done this for two reasons.

Many have written about the respective tasks of these two kinds of lawyers; and in England those who have done so have stressed how different they are. There is, of course, some truth in these assertions; but in our view these differences have also been exaggerated – at any rate whenever one is trying to make the one group work closely with the other, as we feel they must. For in such circumstances academics must try to present their theories in any way that makes them palatable to practitioners; if they do not, their dish (for which read ideas) will not be savoured.

To the extent that the book describes in *modest* detail what can be claimed in the event of personal (not fatal) injuries in the three systems compared, it tries to serve the first constituency. Two of us – Basil Markesinis and Augustus Ullstein – have encountered this need in our professional careers; and one more – Guido Alpa – also practises as an *avvocato* in Rome and Genoa and knows the needs of the profession.

If the first of our targeted groups needs 'usable' data, the second needs *thoughts and ideas* that can promote further reflection. Here the effort had to go into the 'packaging' of the information we assembled for this book in a way that made it look more than just a list of similar and different solutions. Here, two of us – Basil Markesinis and Michael Coester – took

more time to achieve this overall result by going over the entire text several times and minimising, whenever possible, the effects of a presentation that was too slanted towards national habits and methods. A few words need to be said about the difficulties the authors encountered in carrying out this enterprise.

Since this book was written in English and primarily addresses an Anglophone readership, inevitably it had to take as its starting point the classification structure known to the common law. If, as we hope, the reader thinks that, overall, the presentation of the English, German and Italian law makes good reading, it means that we have succeeded in our 'packaging' efforts of the other two legal systems. But this was by no means an easy task, as the specialist reader of any of these systems can attest. For the truth of the matter is that the structures, divisions, concepts and notions used in this book, being of common law origin, did not always fit in easily with what exists in Germany and Italy, which is often very different to the English. Even the writing style of lawyers who come from different countries is different and here, again, we have tried to produce a work which will sit well in the library of a common lawyer. But 'different' does not mean less valid, less interesting or less attractive. This, too, is made clear in several parts of the narrative; and tribute is here paid to the two non-common lawyers who co-authored this book and so generously agreed to comply with the demands of English language and practice.

'Packaging', thus *had* to take place for, otherwise, the Continental systems discussed in this book, which have served as models for many countries, would continue to be a mystery to anyone but their own nationals and devotees. In our view, the increasingly transnational nature of personal injuries litigation cannot tolerate such parochialism. Thus, the contribution to the art of 'packaging' forms the first part of the intellectual contribution this book tries to make to the art of comparison; the synthesising conclusions form the other. Broadly speaking, the whole enterprise follows the approach advocated by one of us on many occasions, most recently in his monograph entitled *Comparative Law in the Courtroom and the Classroom: The Story of the Last Thirty Five Years* (Hart Publishing, 2003) (this will soon appear in French, German and Italian translations, an indication perhaps of the interest this method is attracting in these countries) and has tried to avoid the format of a questionnaire which jurists from different systems dutifully fill in. Such works may be useful in one sense; but from a scholarly angle they seem less appealing.

One last word is needed on 'packaging'.

A number of contemporary comparatists have objected to such efforts at 'packaging' foreign law. They say it does not work. They also argue that it 'betrays' the essential features of the foreign system, which must be seen in its wider environment. We see no betrayal whatsoever in an effort which tries to make national wisdom and experience internationally known and appreciated. And we affected no cover-up of the essential features of a particular system, as our readers will see when reading *carefully* what one could loosely describe as the components of the book which contain the information about national law. For from them one can glean additional information about history, the sources of law, the identity of the major protagonists, the abstract or concrete mould of mind of each system compared in this book, the style of judgments, as well as find out how they compensate different headings of damage. Dare we thus say it? This book, like most books which contain personal experiences of many years and not just information, should therefore be read on two levels: the obvious and the concealed.

That despite our efforts, disagreements may still persist about the method is as possible as it is likely that the information provided on each particular issue will not always be found to be as extensive in all three systems under comparison. This, for instance, becomes obvious in chapter 3 as a result of the unwillingness of Italian law to devise different rules for calculating past and future economic losses. Here, then, no amount of 'packaging' could (or should) conceal existing difference. The reader must be left free to decide if the differences are 'apparent' rather than 'real', as well as the more difficult question whether the approach of Italian law could be improved. Once again, the accusation of 'betraying' a foreign system by making it accessible to lawyers of another is, to us, ludicrous.

For us, however, making value judgments of this kind was a matter of lesser import. For, this, essentially, is an essay in comparative methodology which all of us, in our similar and different ways of 'making a living out of the law', are trying to develop in order to practise our profession. If the attempt to innovate has carried with it problems, we were willing to confront them and even risk falling into error since we know that all human action entails the risk of error. For, as the great Goethe (in *Faust*, Part I (1790; Insel edn, 1965), p. 16) put it, *Es irrt der Mensch, solang er strebt*. The alternative – inaction – was not an option.

Basil Markesinis QC, FBA (London and Texas); Guido Alpa, FBA (Rome and Genoa); Michael Coester (Munich); Augustus Ullstein QC (Temple)
London, Genoa, Munich, 24 December 2003

Table of cases

Common law cases

- A v. National Blood Authority* [2002] Lloyd's Law Reports Medical 487
page 181, 199
- A.B. v. South West Water Services Ltd* [1993] QB 507, CA 3
- A.B. v. Tameside and Glossop Health Authority* [1997] 8 Med. L.R. 91, CA 55
- A.E.I. Rediffusion Music Ltd v. Phonographic Performance Ltd* [1999] 1 WLR
1507, CA 29
- Alcock v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police* [1992] 1 AC 310, HL(E)
51–52, 54, 56
- Andrews v. Reynolds Memorial Hospital, Inc.*, 499 S.E. 2d 846 (W.Va. 1997)
215
- Andrews v. Secretary of State for Health* [2000] 54 BMLR 111 [2000] Lloyd's
Reports Medical 121 56
- Annable v. South Derbyshire Health Authority* [2001] QB 272, CA 49
- Appleton v. Garrett* [1996] 5 PIQR P1, QBD 45
- Atkinson v. Seghal* [2003] All ER (D) 341 (Mar), CA Civil Division, Judgment
of 21 March 2003 53
- Auty v. National Coal Board* [1985] 1 WLR 784, CA 118, 138
- Barnet Group Hospital Management Committee v. Eagle Star Insurance Co. Ltd*
[1960] 1 QB 107 99
- Barrow v. Bankside Members Agency Ltd* [1996] 1 WLR 257, CA 36
- Behrens v. Bertram Mills Circus Ltd* [1957] 2 QB 1 54
- Bell v. The Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland* (1890) 26 LR Ir. 428
53
- Bell v. Todd* [2002] Lloyd's Rep. Med. 12, QBD 134, 174
- Birkett v. Hayes* [1982] 1 WLR 816, CA 10

- Blamire v. South Cumbria Health Authority* [1993] PIQR Q 1 123, 126
- Bourhill (Hay) v. Young* [1943] AC 92, HL (Sc) 54
- Bowling v. Pfizer, Inc. (Shiley Heart Valve Litigation)* 143 F.R.D. 141 (S.D. Ohio 1992), 159 F.R.D. 492 (S.D. Ohio 1994), 502, 521 202, 205
- Bradford-Smart v. West Sussex County Council* [2002] 1 FCR 425; [2002] LGR 489, CA 55
- Brightman v. Johnson*, *The Times*, December 17th 1985 48
- British Transport Commission v. Gourley* [1956] AC 185, HL (E) 98, 123
- Brittain v. Garner*, *The Times*, February 18 1989 125
- Brown v. Merton, Sutton and Wandsworth Area Health Authority (Teaching)* [1982] 1 All ER 650, CA 135
- Browning v. War Office* [1963] 1 QB 750, CA 173
- Brunsdon v. Humphrey* (1884) 14 QBD 141, CA 36
- Burns v. Edman* [1970] 2 QB 541 123
- Byers v. London Borough of Brent*, QBD, Judgment of 24 April 1998 (Unreported) 59
- Callery v. Gray (Nos. 1 and 2)* [2002] UKHL 28; [2002] 1 WLR 2000 30
- Cassell v. Riverside Health Authority* [1992] PIQR Q168, CA 126
- Chatelain v. Kelley*, 322 Ark. 517, 910 S.W.2d 215 (1995) 215
- Clarke v. Rotax Aircraft Equipment Ltd* [1975] 1 WLR 1570, CA 10
- Coenen v. Payne* [1974] 1 WLR 984, CA 39
- Connolly v. Tasker* [2001] QB 272, CA 49
- Cook v. J.L. Kier and Co.* [1970] 1 WLR 774, CA 47
- Cookson v. Knowles* [1979] AC 556, HL(E) 122
- Cooper v. Firth Brown Ltd* [1963] 1 WLR 418 98, 123
- Cunningham v. Harrison* [1973] QB 942, CA 98, 100, 104, 129, 133, 172
- Daly v. General Steam Navigation Co. Ltd* [1981] 1 WLR 120, CA 99
- Despina R., The* [1979] AC 685, HL(E) 36
- Dews v. National Coal Board* [1988] AC 1, HL(E) 98, 137
- Dimick v. Schiedt*, 293 U.S. 484 (1935) 209
- Dobbie v. Medway Health Authority* [1994] 1 WLR 1234, CA 176
- Donnelly v. Joyce* [1974] QB 454, CA 97, 100, 102, 129–30
- Dooley v. Cammell Laird & Co. Ltd* [1951] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 271 56
- Dow Corning Corporation, In re*, 255 B.R. 445 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2000) 199, 201, 202, 205, 206, 210
- Dulieu v. White & Sons* [1901] 2 KB 669 53
- Duller v. South East Lincs Engineers* [1981] C.L.Y. 585 123
- Dunn v. Rose Way, Inc.*, 333 N.W.2d 830 (Iowa 1983) 215

Dunnett v. Railtrack plc (in railway administration) [2002] EWCA Civ 303;
[2002] 1 WLR 2434, CA 206

Evans v. Pontyprida Roofing Ltd [2001] EWCR Civ 1657 100

Fashade v. North Middlesex Hospital NHS Trust November 10th 2000, Wright
J. [2001] C.L.Y. 1712 42

Firle Investments Ltd v. Datapoint International Ltd [2001] EWCA Civ 1106
29

Fish v. Wilcox and Gwent Health Authority [1994] 5 Med. L.R. 230 101

Fitzgerald v. Ford [1996] PIQR Q72 100, 116

Fletcher v. Autocar and Transporters Ltd [1968] 2 QB 322, CA 47

Fournier v. Canadian National Railway Company [1972] AC 167, PC 36

Fuhri v. Jones [1979] CA (Unreported) 50

Galt v. British Railways Board (1983) 133 NLJ 870 56

George v. Pinnock [1973] 1 WLR 118, CA 10

George v. Stagecoach [2003] EWCH 2042 126

Giardina v. Bennett, 111 N.J. 412; 545 A.2d 139 (1988) 215

Gower v. London Borough of Bromley [1999] ELR 356, CA 55

Greator v. Greator [2000] 1 WLR 1970 81

Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Company, 119 Cal. App.3d 757, 174 Cal.Rptr. 348
(1981) 209

H. v. Ministry of Defence [1991] 2 QB 103, CA 9

H. West & Son Ltd v. Shephard [1964] AC 326, HL (E) 47, 48

Hale v. London Underground Ltd [1993] PIQR Q30 59

Halloran v. Delaney [2002] EWCA Civ 1258; [2003] 1 WLR 28 30

Hardwick v. Hudson [1999] 1 WLR 1770, CA 101, 130

Harris v. Brights Asphalt Contractors Ltd [1953] 1 QB 617 127

Harris v. Empress Motors Ltd [1984] 1 WLR 212, CA 138

Harris v. Harris [1973] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 445, CA 10

Haumersen v. Ford Motor Company, 257 N.W.2d 7 (Iowa 1977) 215

Heil v. Rankin [2001] QB 272, CA 16, 49, 50

Helfend v. Southern California Rapid Transit District, 2 Cal.3d 1, 465 P.2d 61
(1970) 213

Hewson v. Downs [1970] 1 QB 73 (Sheffield Assizes) 172

Hicks v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police [1992] 2 All ER 65, HL(E)
47

Hinz v. Berry [1970] 2 QB 40, CA 51

- Hodgson v. Trapp* [1989] AC 807, HL(E) 102, 173
Hoffman v. Sofaer [1982] 1 WLR 1350 36, 47
Hogg v. Doyle, CA, Judgment of 6 March 1991 (Unreported) 101
Housecroft v. Burnett [1986] 1 All ER 332, CA 48, 101, 125, 131
Hunt v. Severs [1993] QB 815, CA; [1994] 2 AC 350, HL(E) 100, 129, 130–1, 157
Hunter v. Butler [1996] RTR 396, CA 123
Hussain v. New Taplow Paper Mills Ltd [1988] AC 514, HL(E) 173

Ichard v. Frangoulis [1977] 1 WLR 556 47

Jaensch v. Coffey (1984) 155 CLR 549 53
Jefford v. Gee [1970] 2 QB 130 9, 10
Jones v. Jones [1985] QB 704, CA 105
Justus v. Atchison, 19 Cal. 3d 564, 565 P.2d 122 (1977) 215

Kars v. Kars (1996) 141 ALR 37 100
Kent v. Griffiths (No.2) [2001] QB 272, CA 49
King v. Phillips [1953] 1 QB 429, CA 54
Kralj v. McGrath [1986] 1 All ER 54 3, 45
Krishnan v. Sepulveda, 916 S.W.2d 478 (Tex.1995) 215
Kroeker v. Jansen (1995) 123 DLR (4th) 652 100
Kuddus v. Chief Constable of Leicestershire Constabulary [2001] UKHL 29; [2001] 2 WLR 1789 45

Lanford v. Hebran [2001] EWCA Civ 361; [2001] PIQR Q160 59
Leon Seng Tan v. Bunnage July 23rd 1986 (Unreported) 102
Letang v. Cooper [1965] 1 QB 232, CA 45
Lim Poh-Choo v. Camden and Islington Area Health Authority [1979] QB 196, CA; [1980] AC 174, HL(E) 10, 37–8, 47, 48, 118, 127
London Ambulance Service NHS Trust v. Swan, CA, Judgment of 12 March 1999 (Unreported) 138
Longden v. British Coal Corporation [1998] AC 653, HL(E) 172

Masterman-Lister v. Jewell [2003] 1 WLR 1511, CA 177
McCamley v. Cammell Laird Shipbuilders Ltd [1990] 1 WLR 963, CA 132
McFarlane v. EE Caledonia Ltd [1994] 2 All ER 1, CA 56
Meah v. McCremer (No.1) [1985] 1 All ER 367 53
Metcalfe v. London Passenger Transport Board [1938] 2 All ER 352 36
Miliangos v. George Frank (Textiles) Ltd [1976] AC 443, HL(E) 36

- Milton v. Cary Medical Center*, 358 A.2d 252 (Me. 1988) 215
- Mitchell v. Mulholland (No.2)* [1972] 1 QB 65, CA 118
- Moeliker v. A. Reyrolle & Co. Ltd* [1977] 1 WLR 132, CA 126
- Moen v. Hanson*, 85 Wn.2d 597, 537 P.2d 266 (Wash. 1975) 215
- Moore v. Shah*, 458 N.Y.S. 2d 33 (1982) 133
- Moriarty v. McCarthy* [1978] 1 WLR 155 58, 104, 133
- Nash v. Eli Lilly & Co.* [1993] 1 WLR 782, CA 176, 177
- Nobles v. Schofield*, CA, Judgment of 14 May 1998 53
- North Glamorgan NHS Trust v. Walters* (2002) EWCA Civ 1792; [2002] All ER (D) 87 (Dec); [2003] Lloyd's Rep. Med. 49 53
- Ornelas v. Fry*, 727 P.2d 819 (Ariz. App., 1986) 133
- Osman v. United Kingdom* [1999] 1 FLR 193 201
- Page v. Sheerness Steel Co. Plc* [1996] PIQR Q26. 122, 138
see also *Wells v. Wells*
- Page v. Smith* [1996] 1 AC 155, HL(E) 53, 54
- Phelps v. Hillingdon London Borough Council* [2001] 2 AC 619, HL(E) 55
- Pickett v. British Rail Engineering Ltd* [1980] AC 136, HL(E) 10, 161
- Prather v. Lockwood*, 19 Ill.App.3d 146; 310 N.E. 2d 815 (1974) 215
- Pratt (Keith) v. Collie Smith Mr David Froskett Q.C.* (Unreported) 59
- Pritchard v. J.H. Cobden Ltd* [1987] 2 WLR 627, CA 105
- Ramsay v. Rivers* [2002] QB 272, CA 49
- Rees v. Mabco (102) Ltd (in liquidation)* [2001] QB 272, CA 49
- Rialas v. Mitchel* (1984) 128 SJ 704, CA 98
- Roach v. Yates* [1938] 1 KB 256, CA 128
- Roberts v. Johnstone* [1989] QB 878, CA 135
- Robertson v. Forth Road Bridge Joint Board* [1995] IRLR 251, Ct of Session 56
- Robinson v. Harman* (1848) 1 Exch. 850; 154 ER 363 117
- Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 93 S. Ct 705 (1973) 215
- Ryan v. Liverpool Health Authority* [2002] Lloyd's Rep. Med. 23 134, 174
- Sayers v. SmithKline Beecham plc* [2002] EWHC 1280 202, 210
- Schofield v. Saunders & Taylor Ltd* [2001] 1 QB 272, CA 49
- Schott Kem Ltd v. Bentley* [1991] 1 QB 61, CA 39
- Shaw v. Wirral Health Authority* [1993] 4 Med. LR 275 99
- Sirianni v. Anna*, 285 N.Y.S. 2d 709 (1967) 133

<i>Smith v. Manchester Corporation</i> [1974] 17 KIR 1, CA	126	
<i>Smoker v. London Fire & Civil Defence Authority</i> (1991) 2 AC 502, HL(E)		173
<i>Spittle v. Bunney</i> [1988] 1 WLR 847, CA	175	
<i>State of Missouri ex rel. Hardin v. Sanders</i> , 538 S.W.2d 336 (1976)		215
<i>Stubbings v. United Kingdom</i> (1997) 23 EHRR 213	176	
<i>Stubbings v. Webb</i> [1993] AC 498, HL(E)	176	
<i>Summerfield v. Superior Court</i> , 144 Ariz. 467, 698 P.2d 712 (1985)		215
<i>Tanner v. Hartog</i> , 696 So. 2d 705 (Fla. 1997)	215	
<i>Taylor v. O'Connor</i> [1971] AC 115, HL(E)	118	
<i>Thomas v. Brighton Health Authority</i> , see <i>Wells v. Wells</i>		
<i>Thompson v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> , <i>Hsu v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> [1998] QB 498, CA	9, 45	
<i>Thurston v. Todd</i> (1966) 84 WN Pt 1 (NSW) 231	118	
<i>Urbanski v. Patel</i> [1978] 84 DLR (3d) 650	133	
<i>Victorian Railways Commissioners v. Coultas</i> (1888) 3 App. Cas. 222, PC		53
<i>Volk v. Baldazo</i> , 103 Idaho 570, 651 P. 2d 11 (1982)	215	
<i>W. v. Meah</i> (1986) 1 All ER 935	45	
<i>Wadey v. Surrey County Council</i> [2000] 1 WLR 820, HL(E&Sc)	175	
<i>Wagon Mound, The (No. 1)</i> , [1961] AC 388, PC	54	
<i>Ward v. James</i> [1966] 1 QB 273, CA	9	
<i>Warren v. Northern General Hospital NHS Trust</i> [2001] QB 272, CA	49	
<i>Warriner v. Warriner</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 81; [2003] 3 All ER 447	121	
<i>Wells v. Wells</i> [1997] 1 WLR 652, CA; [1999] 1 AC 345, HL(E)	38, 118, 119, 120, 122, 135, 138	
<i>White v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police</i> [1999] 2 AC 455, HL(E)	53, 56, 57-58	
<i>Willett v. North Bedfordshire Health Authority</i> (1992) 143 NLJ 745, QBD	136	
<i>Williams v. BOC Gases Ltd</i> [2000] ICR 1181, CA	174	
<i>Willson v. Ministry of Defence</i> [1991] 1 All ER 638	40-41, 42	
<i>Wilson & Clyde Coal Company Ltd v. English</i> (1938) AC 57, HL(Sc)		57
<i>Winkworth v. Hubbard</i> [1960] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 150	98	
<i>Wise v. Kaye</i> [1962] 1 QB 638, CA	46, 48	
<i>Witty v. American General Capital Distributors, Inc.</i> , 727 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. 1987)	215	
<i>Wood v. British Coal Corporation</i> [1981] 2 AC 502, HL(E)	173	