

ASPEN CASEBOOK SERIES

*BEST
BARNES*

BASIC TORT LAW
Cases, Statutes, and Problems

*Third
Edition*



Wolters Kluwer
Law & Business

ASPEN PUBLISHERS

BASIC TORT LAW

*Cases, Statutes, and
Problems*

Third Edition

Arthur Best

Professor of Law
University of Denver

David W. Barnes

Distinguished Research Professor of Law
Seton Hall University



Wolters Kluwer

Law & Business

AUSTIN BOSTON CHICAGO NEW YORK THE NETHERLANDS

© 2010 Aspen Publishers. All Rights Reserved.
www.AspenLaw.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 any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to make copies of any part of this publication should be mailed to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Permissions Department
76 Ninth Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10011-5201

To contact Customer Care, e-mail customer.service@aspenpublishers.com, call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to:

Aspen Publishers
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 978-0-7355-9460-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Best, Arthur.

Basic tort law : cases, statutes, and problems / Arthur Best, David W. Barnes. — 2nd ed.
p.cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7355-9460-9 (casebound : alk. paper)

1. Torts—United States—Cases. I. Barnes, David W. II. Title.

KF1250.B427 2010
346.7303 — dc22

2010042018

BASIC TORT LAW

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Vicki Been

Elihu Root Professor of Law
New York University School of Law

Erwin Chemerinsky

Dean and Distinguished Professor of Law
University of California, Irvine, School of Law

Richard A. Epstein

James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law
University of Chicago Law School
Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow
The Hoover Institution
Stanford University

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
Hofstra University School of Law

Robert H. Sitkoff

John L. Gray Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

David Alan Sklansky

Professor of Law
University of California at Berkeley School of Law

Kent D. Syverud

Dean and Ethan A. H. Shepley University Professor
Washington University School of Law

Elizabeth Warren

Leo Gottlieb Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

About Wolters Kluwer Law & Business

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business is a leading provider of research information and workflow solutions in key specialty areas. The strengths of the individual brands of Aspen Publishers, CCH, Kluwer Law International and Loislaw are aligned within Wolters Kluwer Law & Business to provide comprehensive, in-depth solutions and expert-authored content for the legal, professional and education markets.

CCH was founded in 1913 and has served more than four generations of business professionals and their clients. The CCH products in the Wolters Kluwer Law & Business group are highly regarded electronic and print resources for legal, securities, antitrust and trade regulation, government contracting, banking, pension, payroll, employment and labor, and healthcare reimbursement and compliance professionals.

Aspen Publishers is a leading information provider for attorneys, business professionals and law students. Written by preeminent authorities, Aspen products offer analytical and practical information in a range of specialty practice areas from securities law and intellectual property to mergers and acquisitions and pension/benefits. Aspen's trusted legal education resources provide professors and students with high-quality, up-to-date and effective resources for successful instruction and study in all areas of the law.

Kluwer Law International supplies the global business community with comprehensive English-language international legal information. Legal practitioners, corporate counsel and business executives around the world rely on the Kluwer Law International journals, loose-leafs, books and electronic products for authoritative information in many areas of international legal practice.

Loislaw is a premier provider of digitized legal content to small law firm practitioners of various specializations. Loislaw provides attorneys with the ability to quickly and efficiently find the necessary legal information they need, when and where they need it, by facilitating access to primary law as well as state-specific law, records, forms and treatises.

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, a unit of Wolters Kluwer, is headquartered in New York and Riverwoods, Illinois. Wolters Kluwer is a leading multinational publisher and information services company.



PREFACE

This book takes a modern approach to teaching Torts. What makes its approach modern?

Without sacrificing the best of the classic cases, we frequently use *contemporary cases* with language, fact patterns, and issues that capture the interest of today's law school students. Our cases are edited to preserve and convey the language of the law, the factual context for judicial decisions, and the logic and precedents on which those decisions are based.

Although traditionally it has been thought that common law forms the foundation of tort law, increasingly we are coming to find that tort law is greatly influenced by legislative action, reflected in *statutory law*. Our book supplements judicial opinions with statutes, clearly delineated to support student understanding of salient topics.

Rather than inundating the student with a preponderance of undifferentiated exposition, we recognize that note material ought to be supplied judiciously with the aim of facilitating a deeper understanding of the cases and theory. We have gone one step further and organized our notes according to their function:

- *Introductory and transitional notes* promote close attention and deeper insight into doctrinal themes and issues
- "*Perspective Notes*" provide a window to seminal legal scholarship, critical analysis, and legal theory

Our students have responded with great enthusiasm to the *problem exercises* that we've created as a vehicle for analyzing the policy implications of doctrine. Increasingly, problem exercises are becoming a staple of pedagogy in newer course books. Ours are drawn for the greater part from actual cases, with citations provided. We have varied their difficulty, so students have the chance to work with both relatively easy and increasingly challenging examples.

When one looks at the interior of an older casebook, one often has difficulty discerning where a case ends and other material begins. We see no reason to add confusion to an amply challenging subject by obscuring the divisions between cases, notes, statutory material, and problem exercises. Generous use of heading levels and

consistently clear design elements make it a pleasure to navigate through *Basic Tort Law*.

We have modeled our writing style for this book on the clarity and directness that have always been the hallmarks of fine legal analysis and writing. As with the appearance of our pages, we hope that our readers will find that a straightforward writing style helps set the stage for effective learning.

This edition reflects the incorporation of suggestions from colleagues who have used earlier editions. It also contains added cases on the revised approach to duty and proximate cause adopted in the Restatement (Third) of Torts, and it offers expanded legal malpractice coverage; the latter may be of interest to professors who wish to respond to the recent Carnegie Report findings that students need more exposure to ethics issues and need better acculturation and professionalization. This edition also reflects changes in statutes and adds new cases intended to help improve students' understanding of "loss of a chance" and the consumer expectation test. It is our hope that colleagues will find these materials as stimulating to teach from as we have in our own classes. Even more important, we hope that students will enjoy our modern style of teaching, which uses clarity as a springboard for a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the law.

Arthur Best
David W. Barnes

September 2010



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is the joint product of its two authors. We have ascribed authorship to “Arthur Best and David W. Barnes” because Arthur Best initiated the project and was responsible for some early decisions about its style and content, but we consider our contributions to be equal and to be reflected throughout the book. For their generosity in commenting on various parts of earlier versions of the manuscript, we thank Professors John Jacobi, Ahmed Bulbulia, Timothy Glynn, Tristin Green, Denis McLaughlin, Thomas Russell, Joyce Saltalamachia, Alexander Tsisis, and Edward Hartnett. We also thank Douglas Lipsky, Shlomo Singer, and Cynthia Wilson for work as research assistants.

Deans at the University of Denver College of Law and Seton Hall University School of Law provided generous support for this project. It is a pleasure to offer thanks for that to Deans Kathleen Boozang, Patrick Hobbes, Martin Katz, Dennis O. Lynch, Nell Jessup Newton, and Mary Ricketson. We appreciate the contributions of Jessica Barmack, Susan Boulanger, Melody Davies, and Carol McGeehan at Aspen Publishers to many aspects of this book. In particular, we thank them for obtaining a large number of anonymous reviews of early drafts and for helping us to analyze and learn from those reviews.

We appreciate permission to include excerpts from the following articles:

Michael J. Saks, *Do We Really Know Anything About the Behavior of the Tort Litigation System — And Why Not?*, 140 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1147 (1992), copyright Michael J. Saks 1992. Reprinted by permission.

Steven D. Smith, *The Critics and the “Crisis”: A Reassessment of Current Conceptions of Tort Law*, 72 Cornell L. Rev. 765 (1987), copyright Cornell University 1987. Reprinted by permission.

BASIC TORT LAW



SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

<i>Contents</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxvii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxix</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Intentional Torts	15
Chapter 3 Negligence: The Duty of Reasonable Care	91
Chapter 4 Proving Breach	137
Chapter 5 Legal Cause: Cause-in-Fact	175
Chapter 6 Limits on Liability: Duty and Proximate Cause	223
Chapter 7 Defenses	293
Chapter 8 Apportionment of Damages	369
Chapter 9 Professionals	417
Chapter 10 Owners and Occupiers of Land	465
Chapter 11 Special Duty Rules	513
Chapter 12 Damages	581
Chapter 13 Traditional Strict Liability	641
Chapter 14 Products Liability	663
Chapter 15 Trespass and Nuisance	739
Chapter 16 Defamation	783
Chapter 17 Alternatives to Litigation	841
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>871</i>
<i>Table of Statutes and Other Authorities</i>	<i>883</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>893</i>



CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	xxvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxix

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
-------------------------	---

I. In General	1
II. Categories of Tort Law	1
III. Organization of This Book	2
IV. Typical Stages of Tort Litigation	2
V. How Tort Law Works Now: An Empirical View	4
<i>Michael J. Saks, Do We Really Know Anything about the Behavior of the Tort Litigation System — And Why Not?</i>	4
VI. How Tort Law Serves Society	8
<i>Steven D. Smith, The Critics and the “Crisis”: A Reassessment of Current Conceptions of Tort Law</i>	11

CHAPTER 2. INTENTIONAL TORTS	15
------------------------------	----

I. Introduction	15
II. Battery	15
A. Intent to Contact	16
<i>Waters v. Blackshear</i>	16
<i>Polmatier v. Russ</i>	18
Perspective: Historical Developments	23

B. Intending Contact That Is Harmful	23
<i>Nelson v. Carroll</i>	23
Perspective: Judgments as a Matter of Law	27
C. Intending a Contact That Is Offensive	28
<i>Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc.</i>	28
<i>Andrews v. Peters</i>	29
Perspective: Motion for a Directed Verdict	31
<i>White v. Muniz</i>	31
D. Damages for Intentional Torts	36
<i>Taylor v. Barwick</i>	37
Perspective: Summary Judgment	39
III. Assault	39
A. Intending Apprehension of Imminent Contact	40
<i>Cullison v. Medley</i>	40
<i>Brower v. Ackerley</i>	42
Perspective: Motion to Dismiss	46
B. Transfer of Intent Among People and Between Torts	46
<i>Hall v. McBryde</i>	46
Perspective: Transferred Intent	49
IV. Defenses to Assault and Battery	49
A. Consent	49
<i>McQuiggan v. Boy Scouts of America</i>	50
Perspective: Who Proves Consent?	52
<i>Hogan v. Tavzel</i>	53
<i>Richard v. Mangion</i>	54
Statute: <i>Disturbing the Peace</i>	58
B. Defense of Self and Others—The Proportionality Principle	59
<i>Slayton v. McDonald</i>	59
<i>Young v. Warren</i>	62
Statute: <i>Use of Deadly Physical Force against an Intruder</i>	65
Statute: <i>Use of Force in Defense of a Person</i>	65
Statute: <i>Home Protection; Use of Deadly Force; Presumption of Fear of Death or Great Bodily Harm</i>	66
C. Defense of Land and Personal Property	66
<i>Woodard v. Turnipseed</i>	67
Statute: <i>Force in Defense of Property</i>	71
Statute: <i>Use of Force in Defense of Premises and Property (N.D.)</i>	72
Statute: <i>Use of Force in Defense of Premises or Personal Property (N.J.)</i>	72

V. Infliction of Emotional Distress	73
A. Outrageousness	73
<i>Zalnis v. Thoroughbred Datsun Car Co.</i>	73
<i>Strauss v. Cilek</i>	76
B. Severe Emotional Distress	78
<i>Miller v. Willbanks</i>	78
C. Intent and Recklessness	82
<i>Dana v. Oak Park Marina, Inc.</i>	82
Perspective: Frontiers of the Outrage Tort	84
D. Transferred Intent for Infliction of Emotional Distress	85
<i>Green v. Chicago Tribune Company</i>	85
 CHAPTER 3. NEGLIGENCE: THE DUTY OF REASONABLE CARE	 91
<hr/>	
I. Introduction	91
II. The “Reasonable Person” Standard	93
A. Defining and Justifying the “Reasonable Person” Standard	93
<i>Vaughan v. Menlove</i>	93
Perspective: Law and Gender	94
<i>Parrot v. Wells, Fargo & Co. (The Nitro-Glycerine Case)</i>	95
Perspective: Social Costs and Benefits	97
B. Reasonable Conduct as a Balancing of Costs and Benefits	97
<i>McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc.</i>	98
Perspective: Law and Economics	101
III. The Range of Application of the Reasonable Person Standard	102
A. Especially Dangerous Instrumentalities	102
<i>Stewart v. Motts</i>	102
Perspective: Explicit and Implicit Overruling	106
B. Emergencies	106
<i>Myhaver v. Knutson</i>	106
C. An Actor’s Knowledge and Skill	109
<i>Cervelli v. Graves</i>	109
Perspective: The Reasonable Person Test and Juror Discretion	112
D. Youth: Special Treatment for Minors	113
<i>Robinson v. Lindsay</i>	113
Perspective: Fairness to Victims?	116
<i>Peterson v. Taylor</i>	116
<i>Statute: Liability of Parent or Guardian for Willful Destruction of Property by Infant Under 18</i>	119

<i>Statute: Parental Liability for Willful, Malicious or Criminal Acts of Children</i>	120
<i>Statute: Natural Guardian; Liability for Torts of Child</i>	120
E. Physical and Mental Disabilities	121
<i>Poyner v. Loftus</i>	121
<i>Creasy v. Rusk</i>	125
Perspective: Scientific Knowledge and Judges' Knowledge	129
IV. Recklessness	130
<i>Sandler v. Commonwealth</i>	130
Perspective: Recklessness in the Contexts of Neuroscience and Neuroeconomics	135
 CHAPTER 4. PROVING BREACH	 137
<hr/>	
I. Introduction	137
II. Violation of a Statute	138
<i>Martin v. Herzog</i>	138
<i>Thomas v. McDonald</i>	141
<i>Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Co. v. Matlock</i>	145
<i>Sikora v. Wenzel</i>	148
<i>Statute: Breach of Duty—Evidence of Negligence—Negligence Per Se</i>	153
<i>Statute: Presumptions Affecting the Burden of Proof</i>	154
III. Industry Custom	154
<i>The T.J. Hooper</i>	155
<i>Elledge v. Richland/Lexington School District Five</i>	156
Perspective: Compliance with Custom as “Only Some Evidence”	158
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Wright</i>	159
IV. Res Ipsa Loquitur	161
<i>Byrne v. Boadle</i>	162
<i>Shull v. B.F. Goodrich Co.</i>	163
<i>Dover Elevator Co. v. Swann</i>	169
Perspective: Counter-Intuitive Statistical Likelihood of Negligence	172
 CHAPTER 5. LEGAL CAUSE: CAUSE-IN-FACT	 175
<hr/>	
I. Introduction	175
II. Basic Cause-in-Fact: The But-for Test	176
<i>Cay v. State of Louisiana, Department of Transportation and Development</i>	176

Perspective: But-for Cause and Toxic Substances	179
<i>Lyons v. Midnight Sun Transportation Services, Inc.</i>	180
Perspective: Moral Role of Causation	182
III. Alternatives to the But-for Test	182
A. Reasons for Alternatives	182
B. Multiple Sufficient Causes	183
<i>Kingston v. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.</i>	183
<i>Brisboy v. Fibreboard Paper Products Corporation</i>	186
Perspective: Preemptive Causes	190
C. Concert of Action	190
<i>Shinn v. Allen</i>	191
D. Alternative Liability	194
<i>Summers v. Tice</i>	195
<i>Burke v. Schaffner</i>	198
Perspective: Alternative Liability	202
E. Market Share Liability	202
<i>Hymowitz v. Eli Lilly and Company</i>	202
Statute: Infancy, Insanity	208
Statute: Actions to Be Commenced Within Three Years . . .	208
Statute: Certain Action to Be Commenced Within Three Years of Discovery	208
Perspective: Shifting Burden of Scientific Proof	209
<i>Black v. Abex Corp.</i>	210
Perspective: Fungibility and Market Share Liability	214
F. Liability for Lost Chance of Recovery or for Increased Risk of Eventual Harm	214
<i>Matsuyama v. Birnbaum</i>	215
<i>Petriello v. Kalman</i>	219

CHAPTER 6. LIMITS ON LIABILITY: DUTY AND PROXIMATE CAUSE 223

I. Introduction	223
<i>Palsgraf v. Long Island Railway Co.</i>	224
Perspective: Duty as a Question of Law	230
II. Duty	230
<i>Hegyes v. Unjian Enterprises, Inc.</i>	231
<i>Dykema v. Gus Macker Enterprises, Inc.</i>	233
<i>Graff v. Beard</i>	235
Statute: Civil Liability for Social Hosts	237

Statute: <i>Civil Liability of Persons Providing Alcoholic Beverages</i>	238
<i>Eisel v. Board of Education of Montgomery County</i>	238
III. Proximate Cause	243
A. Introduction	243
B. Directness	244
<i>In Re an Arbitration Between Polemis and Furness,</i> <i>Withy & Co., Ltd.</i>	244
<i>Laureano v. Louzoun</i>	245
Statute: <i>Occupational Diseases; Proximate Causation</i>	247
Perspective: <i>The Necessity of a Proximate Cause Doctrine</i>	247
C. Substantial Factor	248
<i>American Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Thorne Equipment</i> <i>Company</i>	248
<i>Chelcher v. Spider Staging Corp.</i>	250
<i>Taylor v. Jackson</i>	252
D. Foreseeability	255
1. Linking Liability to Foreseeability	255
<i>Tieder v. Little</i>	255
Perspective: <i>Who Decides Whether a New Cause</i> <i>of Action Is Valid?</i>	259
2. Relating the “Eggshell Plaintiff” Rule to a Foreseeability Analysis	259
<i>Schafer v. Hoffman</i>	260
3. Difficulty in Applying Foreseeability Analysis	264
<i>Petition of Kinsman Transit Co.</i>	264
E. The Restatement (Third) Approach	268
<i>Thompson v. Kaczinski</i>	269
<i>Behrendt v. Gulf Underwriters Insurance Co.</i>	272
F. Combining Approaches	276
Statute: <i>Legislative Findings; Proximate Cause</i>	277
Statute: <i>Proximate Cause; Standard of Proof</i>	277
G. Intervening and Superseding Forces	278
1. In General	278
2. When Is an Intervening Force Treated as Superseding?	279
<i>Price v. Blaine Kern Artista, Inc.</i>	279
<i>McClenahan v. Cooley</i>	280
Statute: <i>Proximate Cause</i>	284
Perspective: <i>Superseding Causes and the Direct Cause Test</i>	284
3. Negligent Treatment of a Plaintiff’s Injury: Intervening or Superseding?	285
<i>Weems v. Hy-Vee Food Stores, Inc.</i>	285
<i>Corbett v. Weisband</i>	287