

Index

- AB v Ministry of Defence*, 232
 abductive inference, 66
 accessory liability, 106, 115
actio de effusis vel dejectis, 153
Acton v Pearce & Co., 298
 actual frequentism, 62
Allied Maples v Simmons & Simmons, 302–3
 alternative liability, 161–8
 rejection of, 163
Amaca Pty Ltd v Ellis, 246
Anderson v Maloney, 161
Anderson v Somberg, 252
 apportionment, of liability
 in asbestos litigation, 256
 in proportional liability, 230
 asbestos litigation, 168–70, 228–36, 254–7
 apportionment in, 256
 asymmetric overdetermination, 21
Athey v Leonati, 172, 240–1, 297
 Australia, BPR in, 51
 autonomy
 defined, 344
 as informed decision-making, 344–5
 valuable options and, 343–4
 value of chance and, 343–5
- Bailey v Ministry of Defence*, 22, 244–5
Bak v Glenleigh Homes Pty, 303–4
Baker v Willoughby, 21
 balance of probability rule (BPR)
 burden of proof and, 135–6
 consequential-liability causation and, 52–3, 56–9
 meaning of, 61–6
 medical negligence and, 57
 proportional liability in, 236
 standards of proof and, 128–9
 wrong-constituting causation and, 50–1, 54–5
- Barker v Corus*, 222, 228–9
 in CL, 306, 310–11
 exceptional rule of liability in, 236–9
 probabilistic liability in, 293
 Beever, Allan, 180–2
Bennett v Minister of Community Welfare, 240–1
BGH NJW 1981, 201–2
BGH NJW 1983, 203
BGH NJW 1988, 202–3
BGH NJW 1993, 208
BGH NJW 1994, 202
BGH NJW 1996, 203
BGH NJW 2012, 201–2
BHP Billiton Petroleum v Dalmine SpA, 245
Blum v Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc, 74
Bonnington Castings Ltd v Wardlaw, 222–3
Boustead v North Western Strategic Health Authority, 244
 BPR. *See* balance of probability rule
 breach of duty
 to inform, 215–18
 reversal of burden of proof and, beyond medical contexts, 202–3
 reversal of burden of proof and, in medical contexts, 200–6
- Briginshaw v Briginshaw*, 51
Brown v Corus (UK) Ltd, 232
Brown v Superior Court, 166
Brownlie & Son v Magistrates of Barrhead, 242
 burden of proof, 48–9, 101, 122–5. *See also* reversal of burden of proof
 BPR and, 135–6
 casum sentit dominus and, 125
 under Civil Code, reversal of, 158–61
 civility as influence on, 124–5
 consequentialist justifications of, 135–7
 distribution of, 125–6
 under §830 I 2 BGB, 143–4
 elements of, 49

- burden of proof, (cont.)
 - fairness and, 282
 - faute collective* and, 158–61
 - foundations of, 48
 - freedom and, 125
 - garde en commun* and, 158–61
 - under German tort law, 48–9, 286
 - legal framework for, 126–7
 - legal scope of, 48
 - in probabilistic liability, 297
 - proportional liability rules and, 129–35
 - with recurrent uncertainty, 284
 - responsibility and, 125
 - status quo as influence on, 122–4
 - under-deterrence and, 136–7
 - in U.S. tort law, 251–61
- Burks v Abbott Laboratories*, 193
- but-for test, 16–17, 23
 - NESS analysis and, 25–33
- Bydlinski, F., 144
- Canada, tort law in
 - causal inference cases in, 84
 - defendant indeterminacy in, 170–4
 - proof of causation in, 174
- Canning-Kisher v Sandwell & West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust*, 244
- Canterbury v Spence*, 258–9
- Cass Civ 1e*, 7 Feb 2006, 264
- Cass Civ 1e*, 7 May 2008, 333
- Cass Civ 1e*, 8 April 1986, 159
- Cass Civ 1e*, 16 October 2013, 264
- Cass Civ 1e*, 17 June 2010, 160
- Cass Civ 1e*, 18 March 1969, 330
- Cass Civ 1e*, 24 April 2006, 266
- Cass Civ 1e*, 25 Nov 2010, 268
- Cass Civ 1e*, 26 Jan 2012, 268
- Cass Civ 1e*, 27 Jan 1970, 330
- Cass Civ 1e*, 28 Jan 2010, 333
- Cass Civ 2e*, 1 July 2010, 333
- Cass Civ 2e*, 2 April 1997, 156
- Cass Civ 2e*, 2 July 2002, 264
- Cass Civ 2e*, 4 March 1966, 266
- Cass Civ 2e*, 5 March 1975, 266
- Cass Civ 2e*, 12 July 2007, 264
- Cass Civ 2e*, 13 June 2013, 263
- Cass Civ 2e*, 15 December 1980, 156
- Cass Civ 2e*, 16 Jan 1985, 61
- Cass Civ 2e*, 20 July 1993, 334
- Cass Civ 2e*, 20 June 2002, 266
- Cass Civ 3e*, 18 May 2011, 268
- Cass Crim 18 June 2002*, 330
- casum sentit dominus*, 125
- causal counterfactuals, 17
- causal inference, 68–9, 102
 - boundaries of, 80–5, 102–3
 - increased risk in, 82–5
 - proof by generalisation, 80–2
 - statistical evidence for, 85
- causal redundancy, 16
- causal uncertainty, 5–10
 - absence of mechanistic knowledge and, 8–9
 - in Canadian tort law, 174
 - conceptual problems with, 372–6
 - consistency problems with, 378–82
 - in English tort law, 169–72, 220–51, 275–6, 292–325, 372–5
 - factual, 6–7
 - in French tort law, 59–62, 153–61, 261–8, 275–6, 335–6, 372–5
 - full liability and, 275–9
 - general, 6
 - in German tort law, 89–90, 199–220, 275–6, 372–5
 - through human agency, 10
 - indeterminism as factor in, 9–10
 - multiplicity of possible causes, 8
 - normative problems with, 382–4
 - normative significance of, 279–81
 - probabilistic liability and, 335–6
 - randomness as factor in, 9–10
 - scientific, 6–7
 - similarity of possible causes, 8
 - by source, 7–10
 - specific, 6
 - time as factor in, 7
 - in U.S. tort law, 92–5, 161–8, 252–61, 275–6
- causation, proof of. *See also* burden of proof; presumption of causation; proof rules, for causation; wrong-constituting causation
 - in Canadian tort law, 174
 - through case-specific evidence, 75–6
 - for compensation, 105–7
 - for consequential liability, 38
 - consequentialist justifications for, 116–17
 - consistency as issue in, 2–3
 - counterfactual nature of, 9
 - defined, 2
 - economic analysis and, 117–21
 - under §830 I 2 BGB, 148–50
 - in English tort law, 13, 85–9, 169–72, 220–51, 275–6, 292–325, 372–5
 - through epidemiological evidence, 70–4
 - to establish secondary responsibility, 38
 - for establishing cause of action, 39–40
 - freedom of action and, 107–8
 - in French tort law, 59–62, 90–1, 153–61, 261–8, 275–6, 335–6, 372–5
 - general reasoning and evidence in, 68–75

- in German tort law, 39–40, 89–90, 199–220, 275–6, 372–5
- with IBE, 78–80
- through inference, 66–9, 76–80
- justification of, 104–5
- for liability, 104–7
- moral particularisation and, 109–10
- through perception, 67
- probabilistic liability and, 38
- proportional liability and, 231, 234
- reversal of burden of proof and, 206, 221–47
- in U.S. tort law, 92–5, 161–8, 252–61, 275–6
- in wrongdoing, as essential to, 108
- causation, tests for. *See also* burden of proof; presumption of causation; proof rules, for causation; standards of proof
 - alternative analyses of, 33–7
 - but-for test, 16–17, 23, 25–33
 - condition sine qua non*, 16–17
 - contribution by pre-emption, 18–19, 24–5
 - contribution in overdetermined situations, 20–5
 - in English tort law, 21–2
 - in German tort law, 23
 - hypothetical, 19
 - necessity in, 26
 - NESS analyses of, 25–33
 - omission in, 24–5
 - in prevented claim theory, 183–4
 - Stapleton's but-for test of, 35–6
- causative defendants variant, 140, 196
- claimant indeterminacy and, 199
- in English tort law, 170
- in German tort law, 152–3
- under prevented claim theory, 196
- in U.S. tort law, 165–8
- chance, loss of, 339–48
 - attitudinal accounts of, 340–2
 - autonomy accounts of, 343–5
 - damage assessment from, 351–2
 - derivative value account of, 346
 - determinism and, 347–8
 - goods and freedoms from risk, 346–8
 - legal rights against, 348–52
 - non-compensatory damages for, 354–5
 - security and, 345–6
 - value of, 342–3
- Chaplin v Hicks*, 294–5, 304
- Chester v Afshar*, 51
- Chin v St. Barnabas Med. Ctr.*, 252
- Chubb Fire Ltd v The Vicar of Spalding*, 319
- Civil Code (France)
 - defendant indeterminacy under, 153–61
 - faute collective* and, 155–61
 - garde en commun* and, 155–61
 - liability in solidum under, 155–8
 - liability loss under, 11–12
 - liability-grounding causation under, 59–60
 - reversal of burden of proof, 158–61
 - standards of proof in, 59–61
- civility, principle of
 - burden of proof influenced by, 124–5
 - protections under, 125
- CL. *See* loss of chance liability
- claimant indeterminacy
 - causative variant in, 199
 - full liability and, 198–9
 - probabilistic liability and, 356
 - recurrent uncertainty and, 284–5
- classical probability, 62
- Clements v Clements*, 173
- Clough v First Choice Holidays and Flights Ltd.*, 232
- Coffman v Keene Corp.*, 257
- Collins v Eli Lilly & Co.*, 166
- comparative law, 12–13
- compensation
 - as moral responsibility, 109–16
 - proof of causation for, 105–7
- conceptual uncertainty, 15
- concrete endangerment, 150–1
- Conde v Velsicol Chemical Co.*, 73
- condition sine qua non* test, 16–17
- consequential-liability causation
 - in English tort law, 52–3
 - in French tort law, 60–1
 - in German tort law, 56–9
 - proof of, 38
 - quantum extent of damage in, 58–9
- Consumer Protection Act, 11, 192
- contributory negligence, 362–4
- Cook v Lewis*, 170–2
- Cooper v Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati*, 260
- Corbett v Cumbria Kart Racing*, 79
- corrective justice, 111–12, 180–7
- Cottrelle v Gerrard*, 172, 240–1
- Countess Dowager of Seafield v Kemp*, 242
- Cour de Grenoble, 157–8
- Creutzfeld-Jakob Disease Litigation, Group A and C Plaintiffs*, 87
- Cunningham v Charles Pfizer & Co.*, 257
- damage, 41–2. *See also* evidential damage
 - damages assessment
 - CL and, 353
 - IR and, 353
 - with loss of chance, 351–2
 - non-compensatory, for lost chances, 354–5

- damages assessment (cont.)
 with probabilistic liability, 334
Davies v Taylor, 50, 304, 322–3
 deductive inference, 66
 defective blood products, 263–4
 defence of lawful alternative conduct, 41, 214
 defendant indeterminacy. *See also* §830 I 2 BGB
actio de effusis vel dejectis and, 153
 under Canadian tort law, 170–4
 causative defendants variant and, 140, 152–3, 165–8, 170, 196, 199
 claimant injury causation, 175–6
 conceptualisation of doctrines for, 193–4
 under English tort law, 168–74
 extent of loss variant and, 139–40, 151–2, 164–5, 170, 195–6
 fairness and, 184–91
faute collective and, 155–61
 under French tort law, 140, 153–61
 full liability and, 194–5, 198–9
 fungibility requirements and, 167–8
garde en commun and, 155–61
 under German tort law, 140–53
 insolvent defendants and, 178
 justifications for liability under, 174–96
 liability in solidum and, 155–8, 160
 multiple defendants and, 179
 nature of loss as factor in, 177
 non-tortious potential causes in, 193
 prevented claim theory and, 176–7
 probabilistic liability and, 356
 proportional liability with, 194–5
 recurrent uncertainty and, 284–5
 rejection of, under Civil Code, 153–5
 reliance upon wrongdoing and, 189–91
 remoteness as factor in, 177–8
 RI argument, 190–1
 Second Restatement of Torts and, 162–3
 in *Summers v Tice*, 161–2
 Third Restatement of Torts and, 162–3
 tortious potential causes in, 193
 untraceable defendants and, 178
 in U.S. tort law, 161–8
Deliktsrecht, 11. *See also* German tort law
 strict liability under, 12
 destruction of proof doctrine, 206–7
 determinism, chance and, 347–8
 deterrence-based arguments
 full liability and, 269–75
 for probabilistic liability, 361–2
 for risk liability, 349
Dillon v Twin State, 19
Dingley v Chief Constable, Strathclyde Police, 75
Dixon v Clement Jones Solicitors, 297
 documentation of treatment, reversal of
 burden of proof and, 207–9, 214
Dorshell v City of Cambridge, 171
 doubling of the risk test, 86
Doyle v Wallace, 301–2
Drake v Harbour, 81, 248
Dudarec v Andrews, 298
 duty to inform
 alternative forms of, 217–18
 by doctors, 215–17
 purpose of, 218
 reversal of burden of proof and, failures in, 257–9
DW Moore & Co v Ferrier, 312
 §823 I BGB, 40
 §830 I 2 BGB, 141–53
 application requirements for, 144–51
 burden of proof under, 143–4
 concrete endangerment requirements under, 150–1
 as exceptional rule, 145
 expansion of, 148
 insolvent defendants under, 187
 liability under, 143–4, 147–8
 nature of loss under, 177
 in older cases, 142
 standards of proof under, 144
 English tort law
 breach of basic duty and, 11–12
 causal concepts in, 16–37
 causal counterfactuals in, 17
 causal questions in, 37–45
 causal uncertainty in, 275–6, 372–5
 causation tests in, 21–2
 causative defendants variant in, 170
 CL under, 367–9
 defendant indeterminacy under, 168–74
 deterrence-based arguments in, 269–75
 establishment of causation in, 39
 extent of loss variant in, 170
 material contribution to injury under, 239–46
 more than wrongful condition under, 275
 nature of duty condition under, 276
 omissions in, 24–5
 overdetermination in, 24–5
 pre-emption in, 24–5
 probabilistic liability in, 292–325
 proof of causation in, 13, 85–9
 proportional liability under, 220
 reversal of burden of proof under, 220–47
 scope of, 10–12
 standards of proof in, 16, 50–3, 247–51
 wrong-constituting causation in, 50–1

- epidemiology
 - Hill criteria for, 71–4
 - proof of causation through, 70–4
- Evans v Queanbeyan City Council*, 246
- Evers v Dollinger*, 261
- evidence, preservation of, 213–14
- evidential damage
 - causation of, 276–9
 - consequential-liability causation and, 58–9
- evidential probability, 61, 64–6
- ex ante risk, 231
- exceptional rule of liability, 183
 - reversal of burden of proof and, 226–8, 236–9
- extent of loss variant, 139–40, 195–6
 - under distinct claim theory, 195
 - in English tort law, 170
 - in French tort law, 164–5
 - in German tort law, 151–2
 - under RI argument, 195–6
- F H v McDougall*, 51
- factual causal uncertainty, 6–7
- Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services*, 168–9, 172, 222, 226–8
 - exceptional rule of liability in, 236–9
 - impossibility of proof and, 239
 - single agents and, 228, 239
- fairness
 - burden of proof and, 282
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 184–91
 - difficulty of proof and, 282–5
 - full liability and, 282–7
 - LP and, 321
 - probabilistic liability and, 364–5
 - recurrent uncertainty and, 283–5
 - in reversal of burden of proof, 205–6
 - RI argument and, 184–9
- false negatives, in standards of proof, 127
- false positives, in standards of proof, 127
- Fatal Accidents Act, 181, 230
- faute collective*, 155–8
 - liability under, 155–7
 - reversal of burden of proof under, 158–61
- Feltham v Bouskell*, 319
- Fisher v Knibbe*, 297
- Fitzgerald v Lane*, 225–7
- Flores v Borg-Warner Corp.*, 254
- Folland v Reardon*, 298–9
- Forster v Outred & Co.*, 311–12
- framing bias, 122–3
- France. *See also* Civil Code; French tort law; *responsabilité civile extracontractuelle*
 - Cour de Cassation, 264–8
 - Cour de Grenoble, 157–8
- freedom of action, 107–8
- French tort law. *See also* presumption of causation
 - article 1382 under, 39
 - burden of proof under, 48–9
 - causal concepts in, 16–37
 - causal overdetermination in, 23
 - causal uncertainty in, 275–6, 335–6, 372–5
 - CL under, 335–6, 367–9
 - consequential-liability causation in, 60–1
 - defendant indeterminacy under, 140, 153–61
 - doctrine of *perte d'une chance*, 326–30
 - establishment of causation in, 39
 - extent of loss variant in, 164–5
 - full liability under, 261–8
 - more than wrongful condition under, 275
 - nature of duty condition under, 276
 - probabilistic liability under, 325–65
 - proof of causation in, 90–1
 - standards of proof in, 59–61
 - tort of negligence under, 40–5
- frequentist probability, 62
- full liability. *See also* presumption of causation
 - causal uncertainty and, 275–9
 - claimant indeterminacy and, 198–9
 - culpability arguments for, 285–7
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 194–5, 198–9
 - deterrence-based arguments, 269–75
 - under English tort law, 220–51
 - with evidential damage, causation of, 276–9
 - fairness and, 282–7
 - under French tort law, 261–8
 - under German tort law, 199–220
 - justifications of, beyond defendant indeterminacy, 268–87
 - material contribution to injury and, 239–46
 - moral concerns as influence on, 271
 - more than wrongful condition in, 275
 - with reversal of burden of proof, 200–18, 231–3, 239–46, 287
 - RI argument and, 285–7
 - simple uncertainty for, 198
 - types of bias with, 272
- fungibility requirements, 167–8
- garde en commun*, 155–8
 - in Cour de Grenoble, 157–8
 - reversal of burden of proof and, 158–61
- Gardner, John, 112–13
- Gardner v National Bulk Carriers*, 260–1
- general causal uncertainty, 6
- German tort law

- German tort law (cont.)
 burden of proof under, 48–9, 286
 causal concepts in, 16–37
 causal uncertainty in, 275–6, 372–5
 causative defendants variant in, 152–3
 CL under, 367–9
 consequential-liability causation in, 56–9
 defendant indeterminacy under, 140–53
Deliktsrecht and, 11–12
 deterrence-based arguments in, 269–75
 double causation under, 23
 Drinking Water Ordinance under, 213
 §823 I BGB in, 40
 establishment of causation in, 39–40
 extent of loss variant in, 151–2
 full liability under, 199–220
 insolvent defendants under, 187
 medical negligence in, 57
 more than wrongful condition under, 275
 nature of duty condition under, 276
 omissions in, 24–5
 overdetermination in, 24–5
 under Patients' Rights Statute, 200–2
 pre-emption in, 24–5
 pre-emption under, 19
 proof of causation in, 39–40, 89–90
 reversal of burden of proof under, 200–18
 RI argument under, 185–6
 standards of proof in, 53–9
 tort of negligence under, 40–5
 wrong-constituting causation in, 53–5
Gouldsmith v Mid Staffordshire General Hospital NHS Trust, 45, 81
Gregg v Scott, 235–6, 299–300, 309–10, 319, 321
Gregg v VJ Auto-Parts Inc, 254
Grieves v FT Everard, 313–14
 gross negligence, 200, 287
- Haack, S., 94
Haft v Lone Pine Hotel, 252–3, 277
Hanif v Middleweeks, 297
Hart v Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, 93
Haxton v Phillips Electronics Ltd, 181
 Health and Safety at Work Act, 238
Henderson v Hagblom, 296–7
Heneghan v Manchester Dry Docks Ltd, 169, 228, 233–5
Hicks v United States, 259–60
 Hill, Austin Bradford, 71–4
Holtby v Brigham & Cowan, 238, 243–6
Hotson v East Berkshire Health Authority, 51, 277, 306–9
 human agency, causal uncertainty through, 10
Hurley v United States, 260
Hymowitz v Eli Lilly & Co., 167
- hypothetical causation, 19
 reversal of burden of proof and, 214
 hypothetical frequentism, 62
 hypothetical negligence, 174
- IBE. *See* inference to best explanation
 impossibility of proof principle
 current law and, 319–20
 justifiability of, 320, 322–3
 litigation economy and, 324–5
 in probabilistic liability, 319–20
 RI and, 324–5
 increased risk liability (IR), 290–1, 339–48.
See also chance, loss of
 under current law, 332–4
 damage assessment and, 353
 with economic loss, 311–13
 with physical injury, 313–14
 quantification of loss in, 299–302
 indeterminism, causal uncertainty and, 9–10
 inductive inference, 66–7
 inference. *See also* causal inference
 abductive, 66
 components of, 67
 deductive, 66
 in presumption of causation, 261–2
 proof of causation through, 66–9, 76–80
 through RCTs, 69–70
 reversal of burden of proof and, 204
 inference to best explanation (IBE), 78–80
 insolvent defendants
 under §830 I 2 BGB, 187
 prevented claim theory and, 178
 under RI argument, 187–9
 intine conviction, 59–60
 IR. *See* increased risk liability
- Jones v Great Western Railway Co*, 67
Jones v Secretary for State for Energy and Climate Change, 86–7
Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital v Koziol, 171
Joseph Constantine Steamship Line Ltd v Imperial Smelting Corporation Ltd, 48
- Kaminsky v Hertz*, 92
Katzenmeier, C., 129
Keefe v Isle of Man Steam Packet Company, 250
Kenyon v Bell, 300
Kitchen v Royal Air Force, 295–7, 325
Kramer v Weedhopper of Utah Inc, 92
Krantz v McCutcheon, 300
- Lander v East Texas Salt Water Disposal Co*, 164–5
Landrigan v Celotex Corporation, 74
Lange v Bennett, 171
Law Society v Sephton & Co, 311

- Lee v Minister of Correctional Services*, 285
Lee v Nursery Furnishing, 222
Leigh v London Ambulance Service NHS Trust, 244
Letnik v Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, 10
Leuer v Johnson, 163
Levicom v Linklaters, 81
 liability. *See also* defendant indeterminacy;
 full liability; probabilistic liability;
 proportional liability; risk liability
 accessorial, 106
 alternative, 161–8
 apportionment of, 230, 256
 causal, in tort of negligence, 42–3
 causation for determination of, 38
 under defendant indeterminacy, 174–96
 deontological constraints and, 131
 economic models of, 270–1
 under §830 I 2 BGB, 143–4, 147–8
 exceptional rule of, 183, 226–8, 236–9
 under *faute collective*, 155–7
 market share, 161–8
 negligence-based proportional, 118
 non-causal, 43–5, 114–15
 outcome responsibility and, 110
 probabilistic, 38
 proof of causation for, 104–7
 in RI argument, 194–5
 vicarious, 106, 114–15
 liability in solidum, 155–8, 160
Liriano v Hobart Corp., 257–8
 litigation economy, 324–5
Lohrmann v Pittsburgh Corning Corp, 254
 loss, theories of, 340–6
 loss of chance liability (CL), 290, 302–14,
 339–48. *See also* chance, loss of
 in *Barker v Corus*, 306, 310–11
 contractual origins of, 294–9
 under current law, 332–4
 damage assessment and, 353
 economic loss or gain in, 302–5
 under English tort law, 367–9
 under French tort law, 335–6, 367–9
 under German tort law, 367–9
 for physical injury, 305–11
 skepticism of, 337–8
 violation of autonomy with, 337
 loss principle (LP)
 consequentialist considerations in, 321
 fairness considerations in, 321
 fit with current law, 315–17
 justifiability of, 317–19
 in probabilistic liability, 314–19
 LP. *See* loss principle
Malec v JC Hutton, 299
Mallett v McMonagle, 52, 299–301
 malpractice. *See* medical negligence
March v Stramare, 240–1
 market share liability, 161–8
 Mäsch, Gerald, 318
 material contribution to injury
 analysis of, 246
 in English tort law, 239–46
 full liability and, 239–46
 historical origins of, 240–3
 in modern law, 243–6
 material contribution to risk
 analysis of, 223–6, 228–33
 as form of weak causal connection,
 231–3
 not confined to mesothelioma, 233–4
McGhee v National Coal Board, 223–5
McGlone v Glasgow Greater Health Board, 77–8
McWilliams v Sir William Arrol & Co Ltd, 17,
 24, 222–3, 305
 medical negligence
 causal uncertainty in, 249–51
 destruction of proof doctrine and, 206–7
 doctor's duty to inform and, breach of,
 215–17
 documentation of treatment in, 207–9,
 214
 exclusion from proportional liability rule,
 235–6
 in German tort law, 57
 preservation of evidence in, 213–14
 reversal of burden of proof for, 200–6
 mesothelioma, 226, 233–4
Mickelwright v Surrey County Council, 250
Miller v Ministry of Pensions, 50
Milward v Acuity Specialty Products Group Inc,
 74
Ministry of Defence v Wood, 74
Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing v
 Atterbury, 74
Moeller v Garlock Sealing Technologies, 254
 morality, consequentialist theories of,
 116–17
 more than wrongful condition, 275
Morgan v UPS, 363
Morin v Autozone Northeast Inc, 255
Mountford v Newlands School, 249
Murphy v Brentwood District, 181
 necessary element of a sufficient set (NESS)
 analysis. *See also* sufficiency
 beyond but-for test, 25–33
 of causation, 25–33
 for false negatives, 28–9
 for false positives, 29–32
 for incompleteness, 32–3

- necessity
 - in causation, 26
 - meaning of, 26
- negligence-based proportional liability, 118
- NESS analysis. *See* necessary element of a sufficient set analysis
- Newbury v Vogel*, 259
- Nichols v Warner, Scarborough, Herman & Harvey*, 297
- Nissen Trampoline v Terre Haute First National Bank*, 257
- no better off rule, 42
- no worse off due to multiple torts rule, 42
- nomological sufficiency, 32–3
- non-causal liability, 43–5, 114–15
- Novartis (Grimsby) Ltd v Cookson*, 86, 232
- Nowasco Well Service Ltd v Canadian Propane Gas & Oil Ltd*, 84
- Nulty v Milton Keynes Borough Council*, 50, 64
- Oberdiek, J., 343
- obligation de sécurité, 263
- OLG Celle NJW 1950*, 144–5
- OLG Hamm 18 January 2014*, 89–90
- OLG Hamm 2003*, 75
- OLG Koblenz NJW 2000*, 55
- OLG Koblenz VersR 2000*, 55
- OLG Koblenz VersR 2013*, 151
- OLG Köln NZV 1990*, 151
- OLG Rostock OLG-NL 2004*, 55
- Otter v Church, Adams, Tatham & Co*, 222–3, 305
- outcome responsibility, 110
 - liability and, 110
- overdetermined situations, 20–3
 - asymmetric overdetermination, 21
 - in English tort law, 24–5
 - in French tort law, 23
 - in German tort law, 24–5
 - sufficiency in, 21
- overtaking causation, 19
- Parker v British Airways Board*, 184
- Party Walls Act, 249–50
- Patients' Rights Statute, 200–2
- PC. *See* probabilistic causal liability
- Performance Cars Ltd v Abraham*, 19
- Perry, Stephen, 341, 344
- perte d'une chance*, doctrine of, 326–30
- Phethean-Coles v Hubble*, 247
- Porat, A. and Stein A., 129, 277–81
- Poseidon Ltd & Sellars v Adelaide Petroleum NL*, 322
- pre-emption, 18–19
 - in tort law, 24–5
- presumption of causation
 - Cour de Cassation and, 264–8
 - with defective blood products, 263–4
 - defined, 261–2
 - by exclusion, 265
 - factual examples, 264–8
 - in French tort law, 261–8
 - inference in, 261–2
 - legal examples, 262–4
 - obligation de sécurité and, 263
 - risk increases as influence on, 265–8
- prevented claim theory
 - causative defendant variant in, 183–4
 - claimant condition as factor in, 183
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 176–7
 - doctrinal boundaries under, 183
 - exceptional rule of liability and, 183
 - insolvent defendants and, 178
 - invasion of right to physical integrity in, 180–1
 - multiple defendants and, 179
 - nature of loss as factor in, 177
 - paradox of, 178–9
 - remoteness as factor in, 177–8
 - untraceable defendants and, 178
 - vindication of, 182–3
- prevention principle, 4
- prima facie* proof, 219–20
- probabilistic causal liability (PC), 291–2
- probabilistic liability, 38. *See also* loss of chance liability
 - aggregate claims for, 365
 - all-or-nothing tendencies in, 337
 - in *Barker v Corus*, 293
 - burden of proof in, 297
 - claimant indeterminacy and, 356
 - contributory negligence analogies and, 363
 - damage assessment with, 334
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 356
 - defined, 290
 - deterrence-based arguments for, 361–2
 - development of, 292–314
 - doctrinal disputes over, in French tort law, 330–2
 - in English tort law, 292–325
 - exclusion of recovery and, 335
 - exposure to risk in, 314–19
 - under French tort law, 325–65
 - impossibility of proof principle in, 319–20
 - incentives and, 361–2
 - injury requirements, 293
 - IR in, 290–1, 299–302, 311–14
 - justification of, 339–48, 355–65
 - justificatory problems for, under French tort law, 335–8

- LP and, 314–19
- minimisation of expected error and, 359–61
- minimisation of expected justice and, 358–9
- quantification arguments for, 362–4
- rationalisation of law, 314–25
- standards of proof for, fairness-based objections to, 364–5
- statistical causal wrongs principle and, 356–8
- as unified category, 290
- upward bias and, 361–2
- probability. *See also* balance of probability rule
 - classical, 62
 - degrees of confidence and, 63–4
 - evidential, 61, 64–6
 - frequentist, 62
 - meaning of, 61–6
 - propensity interpretations of, 64
 - standards of proof and, 61–6
- proof of causation. *See* causation, proof of
- proof rules, for causation. *See also* burden of proof; reversal of burden of proof; standards of proof
 - exceptional, 2–3
 - general, 1, 3, 47
 - justification of, 121–37
- proportional liability, 194–5
 - apportionment in, 230
 - in *Barker v Corus*, 236
 - under English tort law, 220
 - ex ante risk and, 231
 - judicial acceptance of, 236
 - medical negligence excluded from, 235–6
 - probability of causation and, 231, 234
 - punishment under, 132
 - reversal of burden of proof and, 228–33
 - rules of, 129–35
 - under-deterrence and, 136–7
- proportional recovery, 227
- Proven causation principle, 4, 14, 292, 359–61
- punishment, under proportional liability rules, 132
- randomised controlled trials (RCTs), 69–70
- randomness, causal uncertainty and, 9–10
- RCTs. *See* randomised controlled trials
- recurrent uncertainty, 283–5
 - burden of proof with, 284
 - claimant indeterminacy and, 284–5
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 284–5
- Rees v Darlington Memorial NHS Trust*, 345
- relative injustice (RI) argument
 - for causal uncertainty, 380
 - defendant indeterminacy and, 190–1
 - extent of loss variant under, 195–6
 - fairness and, 184–9
 - full liability and, 285–7
 - under German tort law, 185–6
 - in impossibility of proof principle, 324–5
 - insolvent defendants, 187–9
 - levels of liability in, 194–5
 - objection from, 186–7
 - reliance on wrongdoing of another in, 189–91
 - risk impositions in, 189
 - strict liability applications, 190–1
 - untraceability of defendants and, 187–9
- reliance on wrongdoing principle, 4, 175, 189–91
- responsabilité civile extracontractuelle*, 11, 11.
 - See also* French tort law
 - primary duties under, 12
- responsibility, 110–17
 - burden of proof and, 125
 - compensation as, 109–16
 - legal liability and, 115–16
 - moral, for compensation, 109–16
 - outcome, 110
- Resurface Corp. v Hanke*, 171–2
- retributive justice, 287
- reversal of burden of proof
 - in asbestos litigation, 254–7
 - breach of duty to inform, 215–18
 - for causal uncertainty, 206–14
 - claimant injury by defendant under, 247
 - critique of, 203–6
 - defence of lawful alternative conduct and, 214
 - defendant wrongful conduct in, 214–18, 259
- destruction of proof doctrine and, 206–7
- doctrinal rationalisation and, 203–6
- documentation of treatment and, 207–9, 214
- economic justification for, 206
- under English tort law, 220–47
- exceptional rule in, revitalisation of, 226–8, 236–9
- failures in duty to inform, 257–9
- fairness arguments for, 205–6
- under French Civil Code, 158–61
- full liability with, 200–18, 231–3, 239–46, 287
- garde en commun* and, 158–61
- under German tort law, 200–18
- for gross breaches of duty, beyond medical contexts, 202–3
- for gross breaches of duty, in medical contexts, 200–6
- hypothetical causation and, 214
- inference of causation and, 204

- reversal of burden of proof (cont.)
 origins of, in English tort law, 222–6
 under Patients' Rights Statute, 200–2
 preservation of evidence in, 213–14
 primary damage and, 201–2
 proof of causation and, 206, 221–47
 proportional liability and, 228–33
 risk liability and, 221–39
 sporadic, 252–3
 undertaken test results and, 210–12
 under U.S. tort law, 252–61
- Reynolds v Gonzalez*, 261
- Reynolds v Texas & Pacific Railway Co*, 84
- RI argument. *See* relative injustice argument
- Richardson v Mellish*, 294–5
- risk, 83–4
- risk liability, 106, 112–14
 deterrence-based arguments for, 349
 ex ante risk, 231
 legal rights against exposure to risk, 348–51
 presumption of causation and, 265–8
 probabilistic liability and, 314–19
 reversal of burden of proof and, 221–39
- Roadrunner Properties Ltd v Dean*, 249–50
- Robbins v London Borough of Bexley*, 247
- Roberts v Dorman Long & Co Ltd*, 222–3
- Robinson v Bristol NHS Trust*, 250
- Roe v Minister of Health*, 75
- Roman law, causal uncertainty in, 141–2
- Rondel v Worsley*, 298
- Rutherford v Owens-Illinois Inc*, 254–5
- Sanderson v Hull*, 232–3, 237
- Savatier, R., 327–8, 332
- scientific causal uncertainty, 6–7
- Scott v Bradford*, 259
- Second Restatement of Torts, 162–3
- secondary duties to authorize, 183–4
- security, chance and, 345–6
- Seley v GD Searle & Co*, 257
- Seltsam v McGuinness*, 51
- Senn v Merrell-Dow Pharms. Inc.*, 164
- Shawe-Lincoln v Neelakandan*, 250–1
- Shore v Sedgwick Financial Services Ltd*, 312–13
- Sienkiewicz v Greif UK Ltd*, 87–8, 99, 169–70, 231–4, 254
- Sindell v Abbott Laboratories*, 162, 165
- Slaughter v S Talc Co*, 254
- Smith v Cutter Biological Inc.*, 163
- Smith v Leech Brain*, 52
- Smith v Rapid Transit*, 91–2
- South Africa, 285
- sporadic reversal of burden of proof, 252–3
- Spring v Guardian Assurance Plc*, 303–4
- standards of proof, 49–66, 127–9
 alterations of, 219–20
- BGH and, 219–20
- BPR and, 128–9
- consequentialist justifications of, 135–7
- consequential-liability causation in, 52–3, 60–1
- under §830 I 2 BGB, 144
- in English tort law, 16, 50–3, 247–51
- false positives and negatives with, 127
- in French tort law, 59–61
- in German tort law, 53–9
- liability-grounding causation and, 59–60
- prima facie* proof, 219–20
- probabilistic liability and, 364–5
- probability and, 61–6
- proportional liability rules and, 129–35
- reductions in, 247–51
- risk increases in, 248–9
- under-deterrence and, 136–7
- in U.S. tort law, reduction of, 259–61
- wrong-constituting causation and, 50–1, 101–2
- Stapleton, Jane, 35–6, 256
- statistical causal wrongs principle, 356–8
- statistical evidence, 86
- statistical probability. *See* frequentist probability
- status quo, 122–4
- psychological studies on, 122–3
- Stealth Enterprises v Hoffmann Dorchik*, 297
- Steel v Joy*, 18–19
- Stevens, Robert, 341
- Stewart v Ryan*, 297
- strict liability, application of exceptional rules in, 147–8, 192–3
- strong necessity, 26
- substantive liability principle, 4–5
- sufficiency
 defined, 27
 nomological, 32–3
 in overdetermined situations, 21
- Summers v Tice*, 161–2, 165–6, 169–70, 193, 255–7
- Tahir v Haringey HA*, 309
- Technical Chemical Co. v Jacobs*, 257
- Third Restatement of Torts, 162–3
- Thomas (Gramling) v Mallett*, 166
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis, 107–8
- time, causal uncertainty and, 7
- Tom Hoskins Plc v EMW*, 320
- tort of negligence, 40–5
 causal liability in, 42–3
 no better off rule in, 42
 no worse off due to multiple torts rule in, 42
 noncausal liability in, 43–5
- Transco v Griggs*, 232

- The Trigger Litigation*, 236–9
 §286 ZPO. *See* wrong-constituting causation
 §287 ZPO. *See* consequential-liability causation
- uncertainty. *See also* causal uncertainty;
 recurrent uncertainty
 simple, 198
 tort liability under, 129, 185
- under-deterrence
 burden of proof and, 136–7
 proportional liability rules and, 136–7
 standards of proof and, 136–7
- United States (U.S.), tort law in. *See also*
 English tort law
 burden of proof in, 251–61
 causal uncertainty in, 275–6
 causative defendants variant in, 165–8
 defendant indeterminacy in, 161–8
 deterrence-based arguments in, 269–75
 failures in duty to inform, 257–9
 more than wrongful condition under, 275
 nature of duty condition under, 276
 proof of causation in, 91–101
 reversal of burden of proof under, 252–61
 standards of proof in, reduction of,
 259–61
- utilitarianism, 116
- Vaile v Haverling LBC*, 248–9, 306
Vasilou v Hajigeorgiou, 323
 vicarious liability, 106, 114–15
Vyner v Waldenburg, 222
- Wakelin v London & South Western Railway Co.*,
 242
Walker Estate v York Finch General Hospital,
 172, 174
Wardlaw v Bonnington Castings,
 240–3
Watson v Ambergate Railway Co, 294–5
 weak necessity, 26
 wealth-maximisation, 116
 Weinrib, Ernest, 109
 welfare, defined, 117
Whitehead v Bruce, 81
Whitehead v Searle, 298
 Williams, Vaughn, 295
Wilsher v Essex Health Authority, 225
 Wright, Richard, 26
Wright v Cambridge Medical Group, 43–5, 181,
 309
- wrong-constituting causation
 BPR and, 50–1, 54–5
 in English tort law, 50–1
 in German tort law, 53–5
 legal consequences of, 51
 standard of proof and, 101–2
 standards of proof and, 50–1, 101–2
- XYZ Ltd v Schering Health Care Ltd*, 85–6
XYZ v Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust,
 323
- Ybarra v Spangard*, 162
- Zuchowicz v United States*, 257