

## Index

- Abnormally dangerous activities, 275–283
  - appropriateness, 278, 279, 280, 282–283
  - assumption of risk and, 278, 282–283
  - blasting as, 275, 276, 277
  - Cambridge Water Co. v. Eastern Counties Leather PLC*, 277
  - commonality, 278, 279, 280
  - contributory negligence and, 279
  - defamation compared, 303–304, 311–312, 325
  - foreseeability and, 276–277, 283
  - Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 282–283
  - intervening causes and, 276–277
  - Madras Railway Co. v. The Zemindar of Carvatenagaram*, 282
  - Madsen v. East Jordan Irrigation Co.*, 276
  - overview, 8
  - reasonableness factors, 278
  - residual risk factors, 277–278, 280
  - res ipsa loquitur* and, 283
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 276, 277–279, 282–283, 303, 311–312
  - Restatement (Third) of Torts, 280
  - Rickards v. Lothian*, 279–280
  - risk-benefit analysis, 278–279, 280, 281–282
  - Rylands v. Fletcher*, 275–283
  - Siegler v. Kuhlman*, 283
  - Strawbridge v. City of Philadelphia*, 281–282
  - unusually sensitive plaintiffs, 277
  - Yukon Equipment v. Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.*, 276–277
- Absolute immunity, consent as defense to battery, 64–65
- Absolute privilege as defense to defamation, 316–319
- Abuse of discretion standard, nonpecuniary damages, 388–389
- Acquiescence, false imprisonment, 75–78
- Activity level, 16–19
  - external benefits, 18
  - external costs, 18
  - marginal analysis, 16
  - marginal private benefit, 16
  - marginal private cost, 16–17
  - marginal social cost, 17
  - missing markets, 19
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 256
  - privately optimal activity level, 17
  - products liability and, 335, 346–347
  - public good, 19
  - socially optimal activity level, 18
  - strict liability and, 18, 95, 97–98
- Act of God exception, strict liability, 93–94
- Ad coelum* rule, 55
- Adhesion contracts, assumption of risk, 168
- Administration, reasonable person standard, 108–109
- Administrative costs, products liability and, 336
- Adverse possession, 74
- Adverse selection in insurance market, 426
- Aesthetic interferences as nuisance, 292–294
- Alternative equilibrium, 339
- American rule, attorneys' fees, 415–416, 418
- Amusement parks, assumption of risk, 165–166
- Animals
  - assumption of risk and, 299–300
  - contributory negligence and, 299–300
  - risk-benefit analysis, 299
  - strict liability and, 298–300
- Annuities, 391
- Antitrust law, defamation compared, 307–308

Arbitration, waiver of tort rights, 422–423  
 Aristotle, 22–23  
 Asbestos cases, substantial factor test, 205–207  
 Assault, 86–87  
     *Brower v. Ackley*, 86  
     conduct requirement, 86  
     defined, 86  
     intent to harm, 86, 90  
     specific intent, 90  
     speech and, 87  
 Assumption of risk  
     abnormally dangerous activities and, 278, 282–283  
     adhesion contracts, 168  
     amusement parks, 165–166  
     animals and, 299–300  
     comparative negligence and, 171–172  
     consumption cases, 165–166  
     contract law and, 168–169  
     custom and, 124  
     *Dalury v. S-K-I Ltd.*, 167  
     defamation, as defense to, 304, 314–315  
     employment cases, 158–163  
     exculpatory overbreadth, 168  
     express assumption of risk, 166–169  
     *Farwell v. Boston & Worcester R.R. Corp.*, 160–161  
     fellow servant rule, 160–163  
     fraud and, 168–169  
     implied assumption of risk, 96, 312–313  
     imputed contributory negligence, 163–165  
     insanity as defense, 66–67  
     *Lamson v. American Axe & Tool Co.*, 159–160  
     landowners and, 268  
     *Little v. Hackett*, 163  
     *Mayhew v. Sullivan*, 266  
     *McGuire v. Almy*, 266  
     *Mills v. Armstrong*, 163  
     misrepresentation and, 168–169  
     *Murphy v. Steeplechase Amusement Co.*, 165–166  
     “no duty to rescue” rule and, 265, 266, 267  
     nuisance and, 290–291  
     overview, 7, 147  
     *Pomeroy v. Westfield*, 160  
     primary assumption of risk, 171, 344  
     products liability and, 343–344  
     public policy exception, 167–168  
     *Russo v. The Range, Inc.*, 168–169  
     secondary assumption of risk, 171–172, 343–344  
     strict liability and, 96  
     *Thorogood v. Bryan*, 163–165  
     *Tunkl v. Regents of Univ. of California*, 167

unconscionability, 168  
 vicarious liability, 162  
 waiver of tort rights and, 166–169  
*Winterstein v. Wilcom*, 166–167  
 Attorneys, absolute privilege for defamation, 319  
 Attorneys’ fees, 415–416, 418  
 Automatic conduct, 89  
  
 Bailment, 274  
 Barratry, 428  
 Baseline probabilities, *res ipsa loquitur*, 139, 140, 142–143  
 Battery  
     *Aiken v. Holyoke Street Ry. Co.*, 85  
     consent as defense (See Consent as defense)  
     *Fisher v. Carrousel Motor Hotel, Inc.*, 85  
     foreseeability, 51–52  
     *Garratt v. Dailey*, 52–53  
     harmful activity, 54  
     implied license, 51  
     insanity as defense, 65–67  
     intent, 52–53  
     intent to harm, 50, 60  
     internalization principle and, 50–51  
     medical battery, 59–61 (See also Medical battery)  
     overview, 49–52  
     punitive damages, 404  
     transferred intent, 53–54  
     trespass compared, 56  
     volitional conduct, 89  
     *Vosburg v. Putney*, 49–52  
     willful battery, 85  
 Bayes Theorem  
     *res ipsa loquitur*, 139–140  
     substantial factor test, 206–207  
 Benefit externalization, 95–97  
 Bentham, Jeremy, 1, 29–30, 40  
 Blackburn, Colin, 93  
 Blackstone, William, 28–29, 36, 40–41, 42, 168  
 Blasting as abnormally dangerous activities, 275, 276, 277  
 Blindness, reasonable person standard, 111  
 Blood transfusions, products liability, 343  
 “Borrowed servants,” vicarious liability, 188–189  
 Boxing, consent as defense to battery, 64  
 BPL Test, 113–114  
 Bramwell, George (Baron), 290  
 Breach of duty  
     contributory negligence, 149–151  
     negligence, 100  
     products liability, 367  
 British rule, attorneys’ fees, 415–416, 418  
 Brown, John Prather, 175

- Burden of proof
  - defamation, 311, 316, 325
  - negligence *per se*, 130–131
  - res ipsa loquitur*, 138–139, 140
  - substantial factor test, 204
- Business of selling, products liability, 341
- But-for test
  - conditional torts, 217
  - death, inevitability of, 195–196
  - as default test, 198
  - independent torts, 216
  - irrelevance of negligence, 197
  - overview, 195
  - Perkins v. Texas and New Orleans Railway Co.*, 197, 200
  - specificity principle, 196
  - substantial factor test compared, 200–201
  - superseding causes, 198
  - types of cases, 196–197
- Bystander recovery rule, 251–252
- Calabresi, Guido
  - on factual causation, 203–204
  - “law and economics” approach and, 2
  - on nonpecuniary damages, 381–382
  - on nuisance, 284, 296
  - on products liability, 336
  - on property rules and liability rules, 24, 25, 26
- Cardozo, Benjamin
  - on assumption of risk, 165
  - on factual causation, 204
  - natural law and, 30–31
  - on “no duty to rescue” rule, 262
  - on products liability, 332, 334
  - on proximate cause, 234, 247, 248
- Care, duty of, *res ipsa loquitur*, 142–143
- Care level
  - diagrams, use of, 14–16
  - economics and, 11–14
  - expected value of loss, 11
  - marginal analysis, 11
  - marginal private benefit, 11–12, 14–15
  - marginal social benefit, 12, 15
  - moral reasoning approach and, 20–24
  - negligence and, 14, 16
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 256
  - privately optimal care level, 12–13, 15–16
  - products liability and, 346–347
  - socially optimal care level, 12–13, 16
  - strict liability and, 13–14, 16, 97–98
- Causation
  - but-for test (*See* But-for test)
  - contributory negligence generally, 151
  - damages and, 396–399
  - direct causation, 243–247 (*See also* Direct causation)
  - factual causation (*See* Factual causation)
  - negligence, 100
  - proximate cause (*See* Proximate cause)
  - substantial factor test (*See* Substantial factor test)
- Champerly, 428
- Charitable immunity, 193–194
- Chattels
  - defense of property, 73–75
  - trespass to, 56–58, 272, 273–275
- Children and minors
  - consent as defense, 62
  - reasonable person standard, 109, 110–111
  - wrongful death, 395–396
- Choice of law, reasonable person standard and, 109
- Circumstantial evidence of negligence. *See Res ipsa loquitur*
- Civil penalties, punitive damages in relation to, 407, 408, 409, 410
- Class actions
  - damages and, 414–415
  - deterrence and, 414
  - economic analysis of, 414–415
  - litigation costs, 414–415
  - market share liability, 225–226
  - waiver of tort rights, 423
- Coase, Ronald, 26
- Coase Theorem, 26–28
- Collateral source rule, 399–401
  - deterrence and, 399–401
  - double recovery, 399–400
  - Harding v. Town of Townshend*, 399
  - insurance and, 399–401
  - The Propeller Monticello v. Mollison*, 399
  - strict liability and, 400
- Coming to nuisance, 294–295
- Commentaries on the Laws of England* (Blackstone), 28–29
- Common carriers, “no duty to rescue” rule, 262–264
- Common knowledge, *res ipsa loquitur*, 144–145
- Common law, tort law in, 4–5
- The Common Law* (Holmes), 2
- Comparative negligence, 170–172
  - assumption of risk and, 171–172
  - contributory negligence versus, 157
  - damages, 170–171
  - Hand Formula, 172
  - incentives for care, 172, 175–177
  - intent to harm and, 172
  - modified comparative fault, 171

- Comparative negligence (*cont.*)
  - overview, 7, 170
  - pure comparative fault, 171
  - recklessness and, 172
  - single victim cases, 177–179
- Compensated injunctions, 295–296
- Compensatory damages, 377–379
  - deterrence and, 383
  - economic loss rule and, 377–378
  - ex ante* perspective, 380–381
  - ex post* perspective, 380–381
  - liability rules and, 381–382
  - negligence, 383
  - nonpecuniary damages, 383–390 (*See also* Nonpecuniary damages)
  - overview, 377
  - pecuniary damages, 377–378
  - property rules and, 381–382
  - punitive damages in relation to, 407, 408, 409, 410–411
  - restorative purpose, 377, 380–381
  - strict liability, 383
  - trespass, 381–382
  - utility and, 379–383
  - wrongful death, 390
- Compulsive conduct, 89
- Concert of action, joint and several liability, 180–181
- Concurrent tortfeasors
  - Anderson v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.*, 212–215
  - joint and several liability, 181, 213
  - Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.*, 212–215
  - substantial factor test, 198–199, 213–215
- Conditional torts, factual causation, 217
- Conflict preemption, 372
- Consent as defense
  - absolute immunity, 64–65
  - boxing, 64
  - children and minors, 62
  - defamation, 314–315
  - defense of property and, 74–75
  - duress, 61–62
  - fetuses, 63
  - football, 64
  - implied consent (*See* Implied consent)
  - limits of, 61–63
  - medical battery, 59, 62
  - mutual combat exception, 63–65
  - nature of act, 61
  - overview, 58–59
  - qualified immunity, 64–65
  - Restatement (First) of Torts, 63
  - sports, 64–65
  - unborn children, 63
- Consequentialism, 20
- Conspiracy, joint and several liability, 180
- Constitution
  - conflict preemption, 372
  - conversion and, 273
  - defamation and, 321–325, 330–331
  - punitive damages and, 406, 408, 410
  - taking of property, 84
- Consumer expectations test for products liability
  - both tests, application of, 362–363
  - demand curve, 354, 355
  - design defects, 350–351
  - economics and, 354–356
  - hybrid test, application of, 361–362
  - implementation of, 360–363
  - incentives and, 359–360
  - inherent unobservable risk and, 358–359
  - insurance and, 356
  - limited applicability of, 363
  - market equilibrium, 354–355
  - obvious and inherent risks, 365, 366
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 340, 350
  - risk-utility test compared, 357–360
- Consumer Product Safety Commission, 371
- Consumption, assumption of risk and, 165–166
- Consumption effect, 339–340
- Contract law
  - assumption of risk and, 168–169
  - tort law versus, 4–5
- Contribution among joint tortfeasors, 181
- Contributory negligence
  - abnormally dangerous activities and, 279
  - animals and, 299–300
  - both factual causation and proximate cause, 153–154
  - breach of duty, 149–151
  - car wash hypothetical, 152–153, 154
  - causation generally, 151
  - comparative negligence versus, 157
  - damages and, 154–157
  - eggshell skull rule, 156–157
  - employment cases, 150–151
  - experts and, 156
  - factual causation but no proximate cause, 152, 153
  - Greenland v. Chaplin*, 147–148
  - Gyerman v. United States Lines Co.*, 153–154
  - Hand Formula, 156
  - imputed contributory negligence, 163–165
  - incentives for care, 173–175
  - invasion of property and, 149
  - last clear chance doctrine, 157–158

- LeRoy Fiber Co. v. Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry.*, 149
- Mahoney v. Beatman*, 154–155, 156, 177–179
- Nash equilibrium, 175
- overview, 7, 147–148
- products liability and, 343
- proximate cause but no factual causation, 152–153
- reasonable care, 147–148
- reasonable person standard, 149–150
- rescue and, 148–149
- res ipsa loquitur* compared, 150
- seat belt defense cases, 156, 179
- single victim cases, 177–179
- Smithwick v. Hall & Upson Co.*, 152, 153, 154
- sprinkler defense cases, 156, 179
- strict liability and, 155–156
- unusually sensitive plaintiffs, 156–157
- Vosburg v. Putney*, 148
- warnings, products liability, 370–371
- Conversion, 272–275
- First Amendment and, 273
- FMC Corp. v. Capital/ABC Inc.*, 273
- trespass to chattels versus, 273–275
- Coordination, reasonable person standard, 108–109
- Criminal law
- “no duty to rescue” rule and, 265–267
- tort law versus, 4–5
- Cumulative torts, factual causation, 217–220
- Curren, Christopher, 176–177
- Custom, reasonable person standard and, 123–128
- assumption of risk, 124
- Canterbury v. Spence*, 127
- Hand Formula, 128
- Helling v. Carey*, 127–128
- Holland v. Tennessee Coal, Iron & R.R. Co.*, 126
- implied consent, 124
- industry standards, 123–128
- informational asymmetry, 124–126
- Mayhew v. Sullivan*, 125–126
- medical malpractice, 123, 127–128
- overview, 122–123
- Texas & Pacific Railway Co. v. Behymer*, 126
- Titus v. Bradford, B. & K.R. Co.*, 123–124
- The T.J. Hooper*, 126–127, 128
- workers’ compensation, 123
- Damages
- attorneys’ fees and, 415–416, 418
- causation and, 396–399
- class actions and, 414–415
- collateral source rule, 399–401 (*See also* Collateral source rule)
- comparative negligence, 170–171
- compensatory damages, 377–379
- contributory negligence and, 154–157
- defamation, 309–311
- deterrence and, 383, 399
- economic loss rule and, 377–378
- emotional injury, 250–252
- ex ante* perspective, 380–381
- expected net payoff, 412–413
- expected value of loss, 412–413
- ex post* perspective, 380–381
- factual causation and, 396–399
- false imprisonment, 77
- injunctive versus, 429–431
- intentional infliction of emotional distress, 87–88
- liability rules and, 381–382
- litigation costs and, 412–414
- lost chance doctrine, 397–399
- medical malpractice, 387–388, 396–399
- negligence, 100–101, 383
- nonpecuniary damages, 383–390 (*See also* Nonpecuniary damages)
- nuisance, 286–287, 289–290, 295–298
- overview, 8, 377
- pecuniary damages, 377–378
- property rules and, 381–382
- proximate cause and, 154–157
- settlements and, 416–418
- strict liability, 383
- trespass, 56–58, 381–382
- trial outcome and, 419–420
- utility and, 379–383
- waiver of tort rights, 420–423 (*See also* Waiver of tort rights)
- willful, wanton or reckless conduct, 86
- wrongful death, 392, 394–395
- Deadly force, defense of property, 70–73
- Death
- defamation and, 309
- wrongful death, 390–396 (*See also* Wrongful death)
- Defamation
- abnormally dangerous activities compared, 303–304, 311–312, 325
- absolute privilege as defense, 316–319
- antitrust law compared, 307–308
- assumption of risk as defense, 304, 314–315
- attorneys, absolute privilege, 319
- Bindrim v. Mitchell*, 307
- Bottomley v. F.W. Woolworth*, 306
- burden of proof, 311, 316, 325

Defamation (*cont.*)*Cambridge Water Co. v. Eastern Counties**Leather PLC*, 306*Cinquanta v. Burdett*, 313

consent as defense, 314–315

costs of false expression, 326–327, 329

*Curtis Publishing Co. v. Butts*, 323

damages, 309–311

dangerous agent, 305–306

death and, 309

defense of others and, 320

defenses, 311–312

*E. Hulton & Co. v. Jones*, 306–307

effect of, 306–309

esteem, injury to, 301–302

evolution of, 327–328

First Amendment and, 321–325, 330–331

foreseeability and, 306–309, 311

functionalist approach to tort law, 302

*Gambardella v. Apple Health Care, Inc.*,  
320–321*Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 324–325

harm requirement, 304–305, 309–311

*Haycox v. Dunn*, 313

imperfect information and, 327

implied assumption of risk and, 312–313

intentional infliction of emotional distress  
compared, 326

intent to harm, 330–331

intracorporate communication and, 318–319,  
320, 329*Jews for Jesus, Inc. v. Rapp*, 308–309

joint interest communication and, 320

judges, absolute privilege, 319, 329

*Kevoonian v. American Medical Association*,  
312*Kilian v. Doubleday & Co., Inc.*, 317–318

legislators, absolute privilege, 319, 329

level of liability, 302, 325–330, 331

libel, 305–306, 310–311

malice and, 309, 314, 317, 318–319, 320–322

*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 321–323

nuisance compared, 305

other torts compared, 302

overview, 8, 301–303

*per quod* defamation, 305–306, 311*per se* defamation, 305–306, 310, 312, 313*Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps*, 325privilege as defense, 304, 315–321 (*See also*  
Privilege as defense to defamation)

prosecutors, absolute privilege, 319

proximate cause and, 309

of public figures, 323–325

of public officials, 321–323

qualified privilege as defense, 320–321,  
329–330

reasonable person standard, 307

reciprocity as defense, 304, 312–314, 320

relationship-based privilege as defense,  
318–319

relevant community, 307–309

*Rylands v. Fletcher*, 302, 325, 330*Saunders v. Board of Directors, WHYY-TV*,  
308

self-defense and, 312–313, 320

slander, 305–306, 310–311

*Smith v. Byrd*, 317–318

social construct, esteem as, 301–302

social value and, 304, 315–321

special damages, 310

spousal privilege and, 318

strict liability torts compared, 303–304

*Terwilliger v. Wands*, 310

truth as defense, 316–318

truthful information as public good, 325–326

unusually sensitive plaintiffs and, 309

utilitarian approach to tort law, 310–311, 323,  
325

words, 305–306

Defense of others, defamation and, 320

Defense of property

adverse possession, 74

*Bird v. Holbrook*, 70–72, 113

chattels, 73–75

consent and, 74–75

deadly force, 70–73

deterrents versus traps, 71–72

dogs, 71–72

*Green v. Goddard*, 69–70*Katko v. Briney*, 73*Kirby v. Foster*, 73–75

laches, 75

*M'Ivory v. Cockran*, 70

necessity defense compared, 80–81, 82

*Palmer v. Gordon*, 71

personal property, 73–75

real property, 69–73

reasonable force, 70, 73, 74

reasonable perception, 73–74

reasonable person standard, 69

request to leave, 70

Restatement (Second) of Torts, 72

spring guns, 70–73

Defenses. *See also specific defense*

defamation, 311–312

products liability, 344–349

Demand curve, products liability and  
consumer expectations test, 354, 355

- overview, 337–338
- risk-utility test, 356–357
- Demurrer, 36, 37–38
- Deontological ethics, 20
- Design defects, products liability, 340, 350–353
- Deterrence
  - class actions and, 414
  - collateral source rule and, 399–401
  - compensatory damages and, 383
  - damages and, 383, 399
  - factual causation and, 221
  - litigation costs and, 413–414
  - products liability and, 335, 346–347
  - punitive damages and, 401–406, 408–409, 411
  - reasonable person standard, 108–109
- Direct causation, 243–247
  - foreseeability and, 245
  - Hadley v. Baxendale*, 246
  - intervening causes and, 244–245, 246
  - Petition of Kinsman Transit Co.*, 246–247
  - remoteness and, 245
  - In re Polemis & Furness, Withy & Co.*, 245–247
  - Scott v. Shepherd*, 244–245
  - unusually sensitive plaintiffs, 246
  - Vosburg v. Putney*, 246
  - Wagon Mound No. 1*, 246–247
  - Wagon Mound No. 2*, 246–247
- Disability, reasonable person standard, 109–111
- Disabling avoidance of harm
  - “foreseeability plus,” 240–241
  - intervening causes, 240–241
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 259–260
- Dogs
  - defense of property, 71–72
  - strict liability, 299–300
- Domestic animals, strict liability, 299–300
- Due Process Clause, punitive damages and, 406, 408, 410
- Duty
  - emotional injury and, 250–252
  - negligence, 100
  - products liability, 368
  - proximate cause, duty analysis, 247–250
  - reasonable care, 148–149
- Duty of care, *res ipsa loquitur*, 142–143
- Duty to warn, products liability. *See* Warnings, products liability
- Economic growth, nuisance and, 289
- Economic loss rule
  - damages and, 377–378
  - as defense to products liability, 344–346
- Economics, tort law and
  - activity level, 16–19 (*See also* Activity level)
  - attorneys’ fees, 415–416, 418
  - care level, 11–14 (*See also* Care level)
  - class actions, 414–415
  - consumer expectations test for products liability, 354–356
  - game theory, 6
  - Hand Formula, 118–121
  - insurance, 425–426
  - litigation costs, 412–413
  - moral reasoning approach versus, 20–22
  - overview, 6
  - policy and, 10–19
  - products liability, 335–336
  - reasonable person standard, 103–106, 121
  - risk-utility test for products liability, 356–360
  - settlements, 416–418
  - subrogation, 423–425
  - third parties, sale of tort rights to, 426–428
  - trial outcome and, 419–420
  - waiver of tort rights, 420–423
- Eggshell skull rule, 156–157
- Elderly persons, reasonable person standard, 110
- Emergencies
  - intervening causes, 233–235
  - necessity defense, existence of emergency, 80
- Emotional injury
  - bystander recovery rule, 251–252
  - damages, 250–252
  - duty and, 250–252
  - intentional infliction of emotional distress (*See* Intentional infliction of emotional distress)
  - nonpecuniary damages, 383–390 (*See also* Nonpecuniary damages)
  - physical impact rule, 250
  - proximate cause, 250–252
  - zone of danger test, 251
- Employment
  - assumption of risk in, 158–163
  - contributory negligence in, 150–151
  - direct negligence of employer, 191–193
  - fellow servant rule, 160–163
  - frolic and detour, 192–193
  - judgment-proof employee problem, 186, 189
  - vicarious liability in, 184–185 (*See also* Vicarious liability)
- Enabling harm
  - “foreseeability plus,” 241
  - intervening causes, 241
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 258–259
- Enhanced risk of future injury, proximate cause and, 252–253
- Enhanced susceptibility to injury, factual causation, 218, 219, 220

- Epstein, Richard A., 3
- Equitable indemnity doctrine, 181–182
- Esteem
- defamation as injury to, 301–302
  - as social construct, 301–302
- Evidence production, factual causation and, 207–210, 221
- Evolution of tort law
- Brown v. Kendall*, 45–47
  - Castle v. Duryee*, 37
  - defamation, 327–328
  - Dickenson v. Ward*, 37–38
  - direct versus indirect harm, 41–45
  - expansion of trespass writ, 38–41
  - gamesmanship problem, 43–44, 45
  - legal fictions, 38–39, 40
  - manorial courts, 38
  - negligence versus strict liability, 45, 46–47
  - overview, 7, 32–33
  - procedural shift, 46–47
  - products liability, 332–335
  - royal courts, 38–39, 40
  - “Shooting Cases,” 37–38
  - Thorns Case*, 33–36, 38
  - trespass on the case, 40–45
  - Underwood v. Hewson*, 37
  - violence in England, 39–40
  - Weaver v. Ward*, 37–38, 46, 47
- Ex ante* negligence evaluations, 209–210
- Exculpatory overbreadth, assumption of risk, 168
- Excuse
- justification compared, 84
  - necessity as (See Necessity defense)
- Expected net payoff, 412–413
- Expected present value, 393–394
- Expected value of loss
- damages and, 412–413
  - overview, 11
- Expected value of risk, 425, 426
- Experts, contributory negligence and, 156
- Ex post* negligence evaluations, 209–210
- Express assumption of risk, 166–169
- Express preemption, 372
- External benefits, 18
- External costs, 18
- Factual causation
- alternative liability, 220–223
  - Anderson v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.*, 221, 224
  - but-for test (See But-for test)
  - car wash hypothetical, 198
  - class actions, 225–226
  - conditional torts, 217
  - contributory negligence and (See Contributory negligence)
  - cricket fence hypothetical, 197, 207–208, 210–211
  - cumulative torts, 217–220
  - damages and, 396–399
  - deterrence and, 221
  - enhanced susceptibility to injury, 218, 219, 220
  - evidence production and, 207–210, 221
  - ex ante* negligence evaluations, 209–210
  - ex post* negligence evaluations, 209–210
  - functions of, 207
  - Hand Formula, 208
  - incentives for care, 207, 210–212
  - independent torts, 216–217
  - intervening causes, 208
  - irrelevance of negligence, 207–208
  - Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.*, 221, 224
  - lack of information and, 207–210
  - Maddux v. Donaldson*, 217
  - market share liability, 224–226 (See also Market share liability)
  - negligence, 100–101
  - negligence *per se*, 129–130
  - New York Central Railroad Co. v. Grimstad*, 207–210, 211–212
  - overview, 8, 195
  - precaution and, 210–212
  - preexisting injury, 218–220
  - products liability, 367
  - sequential torts, 215–220 (See also Sequential torts)
  - shooter hypotheticals, 221–223
  - substantial factor, 151
  - substantial factor test (See Substantial factor test)
  - Summers v. Tice*, 220–223, 224
  - warnings, products liability, 370
- Failure to warn, products liability. See Warnings, products liability
- False imprisonment
- acquiescence, 75–78
  - barriers, 76
  - C.N. Robinson & Co. v. Green*, 75
  - Coblyn v. Kennedy's, Inc.*, 78
  - conditions of, 77
  - costs of escape, 76
  - damages, 77
  - Griffin v. Clark*, 76–77
  - implied consent and, 76–77
  - overview, 75



- reasonable cause, 78
- reasonable force, 78
- reasonable perception, 75–78
- Restatement (Second) of Torts, 77
- Whitaker v. Sandford*, 75
- False light, 328
- Federal Employers' Liability Act, 135
- Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 208, 375–376
- Fellow servant rule
  - assumption of risk, 160–163
  - exceptions, 161
  - incentives for care, 162–163
  - vicarious liability compared, 162, 191–192
  - workers' compensation, effect of, 163
- Fetuses, consent as defense to battery, 63
- Field preemption, 372
- Fifth Amendment, taking of property, 84
- Fifty percent tendency, 419–420
- First Amendment
  - conversion and, 273
  - defamation and, 321–325, 330–331
- Food and Drug Administration, 371, 374–375
- Football, consent as defense to battery, 64
- Foreseeability
  - abnormally dangerous activities and, 276–277, 283
  - battery, 51–52
  - defamation and, 306–309, 311
  - direct causation and, 245
  - “foreseeability plus,” 240–243 (*See also* “Foreseeability plus”)
  - human intervention and, 232–233
  - intervening causes and, 239–240, 247–248
  - legal arguments, 231–232
  - lightning strike hypothetical, 228–229
  - limitation on scope of liability and, 232
  - as necessary but not sufficient condition for proximate cause, 230, 231–232
  - “no foreseeability” rule, 239
  - overview, 151
  - policy arguments, 231
  - products liability, 367–368
  - rational estimation and, 228–230
  - Ryan v. New York Central Railroad Co.*, 231–232
  - “unforeseeable victim” rule, 247, 248
- “Foreseeability plus,” 240–243
  - Brower v. New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.*, 240–241
  - Bullock v. Tamiami Trail Tours, Inc.*, 243
  - disabling avoidance of harm, 240–241
  - enabling harm, 241
  - Hines v. Garrett*, 241
  - Janof v. Newsom*, 242
  - Kendall v. Gore Properties*, 241
  - Lane v. Atlantic Works*, 243
  - Lundgren v. Fultz*, 241
  - Morse v. Homer's, Inc.*, 242–243
  - “no duty to rescue” rule compared, 258
  - Quigley v. Wilson Line of Massachusetts*, 242
  - reliance, 242
  - Richards v. Stanley*, 243
  - superior knowledge and control of risk, 242–243
- Fourteenth Amendment, punitive damages and, 406
- Fraud, assumption of risk and, 168–169
- Friendly, Henry, 246–247
- Frolic and detour, 192–193
- Functional approach to tort law
  - defamation, 302
  - overview, 1, 2
  - preemption of products liability law, 372, 373–374
  - products liability, 332–333
  - strict liability, 94–97
- Gain-elimination rationale, punitive damages, 402–403, 404, 405, 407–408
- Gamesmanship problem
  - overview, 43–44, 45
  - settlements and, 417
- Game theory, 6
- Gelernter, David, 379
- General intent, 90
- Golden Rule, 20, 103
- Good faith standard, reasonable person standard versus, 107–108
- Grady, Mark F., 112, 210–212
- Gregory, Charles O., 3
- Haddock, David, 176–177
- Hand, Learned, 113–114, 122, 126–127, 128, 145, 156
- Hand Formula
  - comparative negligence, 172
  - contributory negligence, 156
  - custom and, 128
  - economic approach, 118–121
  - factual causation, 208
  - medical malpractice, 128
  - overview, 113–114
  - reasonable person standard versus, 118–121
- Hardwicke, Lord (Philip Yorke), 286
- Harmonization principle, 132, 133
- Heart attacks, reasonable person standard, 112

- Hedonic losses. *See also* Nonpecuniary damages  
disaggregation from pain and suffering,  
386–387  
overview, 383
- Historical background of tort law. *See* Evolution  
of tort law
- Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr.  
on assumption of risk, 159, 160  
on defamation, 302, 330–331  
on defense of property, 71  
on intentional torts, 48–49  
legal positivism and, 29–31  
on mixed questions of law and fact, 137–138  
on necessity defense, 82–83  
on “no duty to rescue” rule, 257  
on nuisance, 288, 295  
on products liability, 345  
on proximate cause, 155–156  
on strict liability, 32–33, 272  
utilitarian approach to tort law and, 2  
on vicarious liability, 187
- Horwitz, Morton J., 23–24
- Human intervention rule, 236–243
- IIED. *See* Intentional infliction of emotional  
distress
- Imperfect information, defamation and, 327
- Implied assumption of risk  
defamation and, 312–313  
strict liability and, 96
- Implied consent  
custom and, 124  
false imprisonment and, 76–77  
medical battery, 59–61  
pleasantry exception, 60–61
- Implied license  
battery, 51  
insanity as defense, 66–67
- Implied preemption, 372
- Imputed contributory negligence, 163–165
- Inadvertent conduct as intervening cause,  
235–236
- Incentives for care  
attorneys’ fees and, 415, 418  
comparative negligence, 172, 175–177  
contributory negligence, 173–175  
factual causation, 207, 210–212  
fellow servant rule, 162–163  
injunctions and, 429–430, 431  
joint and several liability, 182–183  
negligence, 173  
single victim cases, 177–179  
strict liability, 97–98  
subrogation and, 424
- Indemnification of employer, vicarious liability,  
189
- Independent contractors  
manner, means, and details test, 190  
vicarious liability, 190–191
- Independent torts, factual causation, 216–217
- Individual capacity, reasonable person standard,  
107–109
- Inference of negligence. *See* *Res ipsa loquitur*
- Informational asymmetry  
custom and, 124–126  
medical malpractice and, 419–420  
*res ipsa loquitur* and, 140  
“Information forcing,” *res ipsa loquitur*, 145–146
- Injunctions, 429–433  
compensated injunctions, 295–296  
damages versus, 429–431  
incentives for care and, 429–430, 431  
injunctive settlements, 431–432  
nuisance, 286–287, 289–290, 295–298,  
429–430, 431  
objective losses and, 429  
overview, 429  
reverse payment settlements, 432–433  
settlements versus, 431–433  
*Spur Industries v. Del E. Webb Development  
Co.*, 432–433  
subjective losses and, 429  
trespass, 430–431
- Injunctive settlements, 431–432
- Insanity as defense, 65–67  
assumption of risk, 66–67  
battery, 65–67  
implied license, 66–67  
*McGuire v. Almy*, 65–67  
reasonable person standard, 111–112
- Instinctive conduct, 89
- Insurance  
adverse selection, 426  
collateral source rule and, 399–401  
consumer expectations test and, 356  
economic analysis of, 425–426  
expected value of risk, 425, 426  
products liability and, 336, 346–347  
risk aversion and, 425–426  
subrogation and, 425–426
- Intent  
automatic, compulsive, reflexive, or instinctive  
conduct, 89  
battery, 52–53  
consent vitiating (*See* Consent as defense)  
general intent, 90  
insanity vitiating, 65–67  
intent to harm (*See* Intent to harm)

- involuntary conduct, 88–89
- levels of, 88–90
- nuisance, 284
- punitive damages and, 405
- specific intent, 90
- transferred intent, 53–54
- trespass, 55–56
- volitional conduct, 89
- Intentional infliction of emotional distress, 87–88
  - damages, 87–88
  - defamation compared, 326
  - extreme and outrageous conduct, 88
  - intent to harm, 90
  - remoteness, 88
  - as separate tort, 88
  - specific intent, 90
  - Wilkinson v. Downton*, 87–88
- Intentional torts
  - battery (*See* Battery)
  - consent as defense (*See* Consent as defense)
  - defense of property (*See* Defense of property)
  - false imprisonment (*See* False imprisonment)
  - insanity as defense, 65–67
  - intentional infliction of emotional distress, 87–88 (*See also* Intentional infliction of emotional distress)
  - internalization principle, 48–49, 50–51, 69
  - as intervening cause, 236–243
  - necessity defense (*See* Necessity defense)
  - overview, 6–7, 48
  - self-defense, 67–69 (*See also* Self-defense)
  - trespass (*See* Trespass)
  - vicarious liability, 185–186
- Intent to harm
  - assault, 86, 90
  - battery, 50, 60
  - comparative negligence and, 172
  - defamation, 330–331
  - intentional infliction of emotional distress, 90
  - medical battery, 60
  - overview, 50, 89, 90
- Internalization principle, 48–49, 50–51, 69
- Intervening causes
  - abnormally dangerous activities and, 276–277
  - Brower v. New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.*, 240–241
  - Bullock v. Tamiami Trail Tours, Inc.*, 243
  - Central Georgia Railway Co. v. Price*, 239
  - direct causation and, 244–245, 246
  - disabling avoidance of harm, 240–241
  - Eckert v. Long Island R.R.*, 235
  - emergencies, 233–235
  - enabling harm, 241
  - factual causation, 208
  - foreseeability and, 239–240, 247–248
  - “foreseeability plus,” 240–243 (*See also* “Foreseeability plus”)
  - Hines v. Garrett*, 241
  - human intervention, 232–233
  - human intervention rule, 236–243
  - inadvertent conduct not severing chain of causation, 235–236
  - intentional conduct severing chain of causation, 236–243
  - Janof v. Newsom*, 242
  - Kendall v. Gore Properties*, 241
  - Lane v. Atlantic Works*, 243
  - Lundgren v. Fultz*, 241
  - McLaughlin v. Mine Safety Appliances Co.*, 238
  - Morse v. Homer’s, Inc.*, 242–243
  - natural intervention, 232–233
  - negligence causing risk of injury, 239
  - negligence not causing risk of injury, 239
  - negligent conduct severing chain of causation, 236–243
  - “no foreseeability” rule, 239
  - overview, 230
  - Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Horton*, 238
  - potentially negligent conduct not severing chain of causation, 235–236
  - Quigley v. Wilson Line of Massachusetts*, 242
  - reasonable conduct not severing chain of causation, 233–235
  - reflexive conduct not severing chain of causation, 233–235
  - reliance, 242
  - remoteness of, 232
  - Richards v. Stanley*, 243
  - Scott v. Shepherd*, 233–234
  - structural intervention, 232–233
  - substantial factor test, 200, 201–202, 203
  - superior knowledge and control of risk, 242–243
  - Tuttle v. Atlantic City Railroad Co.*, 234
  - Wagner v. International Railway Co.*, 234–235
  - Watson v. Kentucky & Indiana Bridge & Railroad Co.*, 237–238
- Intracorporate communication, defamation and, 318–319, 320, 329
- Invasion of privacy, 328–329
- Invasion of property, contributory negligence and, 149
- Invitees
  - landowner duties to, 267–270
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 264
- Involuntary conduct, 88–89

- Joint and several liability
  - concert of action, 180–181
  - concurrent tortfeasors, 181, 213
  - conspiracy, 180
  - contribution among joint tortfeasors, 181
  - equitable indemnity doctrine, 181–182
  - Gray v. Boston Gas Light Co.*, 181–182
  - incentives for care, 182–183
  - Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.*, 213
  - “no contribution” rule, 181
  - overview, 7, 180–181
  - Rylands v. Fletcher*, 182
  - several liability distinguished, 180, 181
  - vicarious liability as form of, 187–189
- Joint interest communication, defamation and, 320
- Joyce, Howard Clifford, 286–287
- Joyce, Joseph Asbury, 286–287
- Judges
  - absolute privilege for defamation, 319, 329
  - mixed questions of law and fact, role in, 137–138
  - proximate cause, role in, 248–249
  - questions of law, role in, 137
  - res ipsa loquitur*, role in, 138
- Judgment-proof employee problem, 186, 189
- Juries
  - mixed questions of law and fact, role in, 137–138
  - proximate cause, role in, 248–249
  - questions of fact, role in, 137
  - res ipsa loquitur*, role in, 138
- Justification
  - defense of property (*See* Defense of property)
  - excuse compared, 84
  - overview, 67
  - self-defense, 67–69 (*See also* Self-defense)
- Kalven, Harry, Jr., 3
- Kant, Immanuel, 22–23, 28
- Laches, defense of property, 75
- Lack of information, factual causation and, 207–210
- Landes, William, 256
- Landlord and tenant, “no duty to rescue” rule and, 265–267
- Landowners
  - assumption of risk and, 268
  - Burrell v. Meads*, 269–270
  - invitees, duty to, 267–270
  - licensees, duty to, 267–270
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 264
  - overview, 8
  - policy considerations, 268
  - reasonable care, 270
  - reciprocal exchange of risk and, 268–269
  - Rowland v. Christian*, 270
  - Rylands v. Fletcher*, 268
  - trespassers, duty to, 267–268, 269
- Langdell, Christopher Columbus, 29
- Last clear chance doctrine, 157–158
- “Law and economics” approach to tort law, 2
- Legal fictions, 38–39, 40
- Legal positivism, 28, 29–30
- Legislators, absolute privilege for defamation, 319, 329
- Lex loci*, reasonable person standard and, 109
- Liability rules, 26–28
  - Coase Theorem and, 26–28
  - compensatory damages and, 381–382
  - damages and, 381–382
  - policy considerations, 24–28
  - property rules versus, 24–26
  - punitive damages and, 404–405
  - transaction costs, 25–26
  - trespass and, 24–25
- Libel, 305–306, 310–311. *See also* Defamation
- Licensees, landowner duties to, 267–270
- Light, obstruction of as nuisance, 292–294
- Limited duty
  - reasonable person standard versus, 107
  - strict liability versus, 97, 99–101
- Litigation costs
  - American rule, 415–416, 418
  - attorneys’ fees, 415–416, 418
  - British rule, 415–416, 418
  - class actions, 414–415
  - damages and, 412–414
  - deterrence and, 413–414
  - economic analysis of, 412–414
  - settlements, 416–418
  - trial outcome and, 419–420
  - waiver of tort rights and, 420–423
- Loss-internalization rationale, punitive damages, 402, 403, 404, 405–406, 407–408
- Loss of enjoyment of life. *See also* Nonpecuniary damages
  - disaggregation from pain and suffering, 386–387
  - overview, 383
- Lost chance doctrine, 397–399
- Maintenance, 428
- Malice, defamation and, 309, 314, 317, 318–319, 320–322
- Manner, means, and details test, 190

- Manorial courts, 38
- Manufacturing defects, products liability, 340, 349–350
- Marginal analysis
  - activity level, 16
  - care level, 11
- Marginal private benefit, 11–12, 14–15, 16
- Marginal private cost, 16–17
- Marginal social benefit, 12, 15
- Marginal social cost, 17
- Market equilibrium, products liability and
  - consumer expectations test, 354–355
  - overview, 338
  - risk-utility test, 357
- Market share liability
  - class actions, 225–226
  - factual causation, 224–226
  - Sindell v. Abbott Laboratories*, 225
  - substantial percentage of market, 225
- Marx, Karl, 23–24
- Maturity, reasonable person standard, 109–111
- Medical battery
  - consent as defense, 59, 62
  - extension of procedures, 61
  - implied consent, 59–61
  - intent to harm, 60
  - Kennedy v. Parrott*, 61
  - Mohr v. Williams*, 59–61
  - pleasantry exception, 60–61
- Medical care context, products liability in, 341–343, 347–348
- Medical devices, preemption of products liability law, 374–375
- Medical malpractice
  - custom and, 123, 127–128
  - damages, 387–388, 396–399
  - Hand Formula, 128
  - informational asymmetry and, 419–420
  - nonpecuniary damages, 387–388
  - settlements and, 419–420
- Melamed, A. Douglas, 24, 25, 26, 284, 296, 381–382
- Merrill, Thomas, 284
- Minors. *See* Children and minors
- Misappropriation, 328
- Misrepresentation, assumption of risk and, 168–169
- Misuse of product, products liability, 367–368
- Mixed questions of law and fact
  - judge and jury, role of, 137–138
  - overview, 137
- Modified comparative fault, 171
- Moral reasoning approach to tort law, 20–24
  - care level, 20–24
  - consequentialism, 20
  - deontological ethics, 20
  - economics versus, 20–22
  - Golden Rule, 20
  - negligence and, 23
  - personal injuries and, 21–22
  - property damage and, 21
  - “More than doubling” requirement, substantial factor test, 205
- Motor vehicles, preemption of products liability law, 375–376
- Mutual combat exception to consent as defense, 63–65
- Nash, John, 175
- Nash equilibrium, 175
- Natural law theory, 28–29, 30–31
- Necessity defense
  - choice of evils, 82–83
  - compensation for property damage, 81
  - defense of property compared, 80–81, 82
  - destruction of property, 83–84
  - emergency, existence of, 80
  - Holmes v. United States*, 82–83
  - inevitable accidents, 81
  - Laidlaw v. Sage*, 83
  - liability and, 81–84
  - Millen v. Fandrye*, 80
  - overview, 78–79
  - Ploof v. Putnam*, 79–81, 84
  - preservation of property, 82
  - property damage, compensation for, 81
  - public necessity, 82
  - right, existence of, 80
  - scope of rights, 79–81
  - threats to life or property, 82
  - trespass, 35, 79–80
  - Vincent v. Lake Erie*, 80
- Negative liberty, 254
- Negligence
  - Adams v. Bullock*, 116
  - Andrews v. United Airlines*, 119–121
  - Blyth v. Birmingham Water Works*, 114–116
  - breach of duty, 100
  - Brown v. Kendall*, 136
  - care level and, 14, 16
  - causation, 100
  - circumstantial evidence of (*See Res ipsa loquitur*)
  - comparative negligence (*See* Comparative negligence)
  - compensatory damages, 383
  - contributory negligence (*See* Contributory negligence)

Negligence (*cont.*)

- Cooley v. Public Service Co.*, 116–117
- custom and, 123–128 (*See also* Custom, reasonable person standard and)
- damages, 100–101, 383
- duty, 100
- ex ante* evaluations, 209–210
- ex post* evaluations, 209–210
- factual causation, 100–101
- Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Co.*, 118–119, 120, 121
- Hand Formula (*See* Hand Formula)
- incentives for care, 173
- inference of (*See Res ipsa loquitur*)
- as intervening cause, 236–243
- last clear chance doctrine, 157–158
- moral reasoning approach and, 23
- negligence-in-design, 114, 115, 116–117
- negligence-in-operation, 114, 115, 116
- negligence-in-warning, 114, 115–116, 117–118
- “no duty to rescue” rule and, 255
- nonpecuniary damages, 385–386
- ordinary care, 46
- overview, 7
- per se*, 128–135 (*See also* Negligence *per se*)
- proximate cause, 100–101
- reasonable care, 46
- reasonable person standard (*See* Reasonable person standard)
- res ipsa loquitur* (*See Res ipsa loquitur*)
- Rinaldo v. McGovern*, 117–118
- risk aversion and, 120–121
- Risk-utility test for products liability, convergence with, 366–368
- “Shooting Cases,” 37–38
- statutes and regulations and, 128–135 (*See also* Negligence *per se*)
- strict liability versus, 45, 46–47, 93, 97, 99–101
- Thorns Case*, 35–36
- trespass and, 45
- United States v. Carroll Towing Co.*, 113, 122
- warnings, products liability, 368–369
- Negligence *per se*, 128–135
  - burden of proof, 130–131
  - common law claims, effect of existence of, 131–132, 134
  - duty, existence of, 129, 132, 134
  - factual causation, 129–130
  - Fitzwater v. Sunset Empire, Inc.*, 133–134
  - Gorris v. Scott*, 132–133
  - harmonization principle, 132, 133
  - injury of type statute designed to protect against, 129, 132, 133, 134
  - Kernan v. American Dredging Co.*, 135

- Osborne v. McMasters*, 129–130
- overview, 122–123
- proximate cause, 129–130
- Stimpson v. Wellington Service Corp.*, 135
- Tedla v. Ellman*, 134–135
- victim in class of persons statute designed to protect, 129, 132, 134
- “No contribution” rule, 181
- “No duty to rescue” rule
  - activity level, 256
  - assumption of risk and, 265, 266, 267
  - Black v. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.*, 260
  - care level, 256
  - Chandler v. Forsyth Royal Crown Bottling Co.*, 259
  - common carriers, 262–264
  - criminal acts and, 265–267
  - disabling avoidance of harm, 259–260
  - enabling harm, 258–259
  - Erie Railroad Co. v. Stewart*, 261
  - exceptions, 258
  - “foreseeability plus” compared, 258
  - Hardy v. Brooks*, 259
  - Heard v. City of New York*, 261–262
  - invitees, 264
  - Kambour v. Boston & Maine Railroad Co.*, 263
  - Kline v. 1800 Massachusetts Avenue Apartment Corp.*, 265–267
  - landlord and tenant, 265–267
  - landowners, 264
  - L.S. Ayres & Co. v. Hicks*, 264
  - Marsalis v. LaSalle*, 261
  - McMahon v. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.*, 263
  - Moch Co. v. Rensselaer Water Co.*, 262
  - Montgomery v. National Convoy & Trucking Co.*, 258–259
  - negligence and, 255
  - Newton v. Ellis*, 259
  - obvious conditions defense, 265–266
  - Osterland v. Hill*, 255
  - overview, 8, 254–255
  - physician-patient relationship, 257–258
  - policy considerations, 255–258
  - psychologist-patient relationship, 264–265
  - public good and, 266–267
  - reasonable person standard and, 255
  - reliance, 261–262
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 264
  - Ryan v. New York Central Railroad Co.*, 262
  - Rylands v. Fletcher*, 256–257
  - special relationship, 264
  - strict liability and, 256–257

- Summers v. Dominguez*, 259  
 superior knowledge and control of risk, 262–267  
*Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California*, 264–265  
 termination of rescue, 260  
 trespassers, 257  
 utilitarian approach to tort law, 256–257  
*Yu v. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.*, 263  
*Zelenko v. Gimbel Bros.*, 259–260  
 “No foreseeability” rule, 239  
 Nonpecuniary damages, 383–390  
   abuse of discretion standard, 388–389  
   awareness of loss, 383–386  
   difficulty of appellate review, 388  
   disaggregation of components, 386–390  
   *ex ante* perspective, 385  
   *ex post* perspective, 384–385  
   *McDougald v. Garber*, 386–387  
   medical malpractice, 387–388  
   negligence, 385–386  
   overview, 378–379  
   *per diem* argument, 387  
   strict liability, 385–386  
   trespass, 385  
   unpredictability, 387–388  
   variation in, 387  
 Normative theories, 10  
 Nuisance  
   aesthetic interferences, 292–294  
   assumption of risk and, 290–291  
   *Baines v. Baker*, 286  
   *Bamford v. Turnley*, 290  
   *Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co.*, 296–298  
   *Campbell v. Seaman*, 290–291  
   coming to nuisance, 294–295  
   *Commonwealth v. Barnes & Tucker Co.*, 289  
   compensated injunctions, 295–296  
   damages, 286–287, 289–290, 295–298  
   defamation compared, 305  
   economic growth and, 289  
   in fact, 285–286  
   *Gilbert v. Showerman*, 291, 294–295  
   harm-benefit balancing, 286–290  
   injunctions, 286–287, 289–290, 295–298, 429–430, 431  
   intent, 284  
   invasion requirement, 285  
   *Jost v. Dairyland Power Cooperative*, 289  
   at law, 285–286  
   light, obstruction of, 292–294  
   location, importance of, 290–291  
   *Malhame v. Borough of Demarest*, 286  
   *Middlesex Co. v. McCue*, 288, 295  
   nontrespassory nature of, 284–285  
   overview, 8, 283–286  
   *Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Sanderson*, 288–289  
   *per accidens* nuisance, 285–286, 305  
   *per se* nuisance, 285–286, 305  
   reciprocal exchange of risk and, 290–291  
   Restatement (Second) of Torts, 285  
   *Robinson v. Baugh*, 291  
   *Rogers v. Elliott*, 292  
   *Rylands v. Fletcher*, 285  
   *Spur Industries v. Del E. Webb Development Co.*, 295–296  
   unreasonable invasion versus unreasonable activity, 295  
   unreasonable nature of, 285  
   unusually sensitive plaintiffs, 291–292  
   utilitarian approach to tort law, 288, 290–291, 293, 294, 295  
   view, obstruction of, 292–294  
   *Vogel v. Grant-Lafayette Electric Cooperative*, 285  
   *Waschak v. Moffat*, 288  
 Objectivity, reasonable person standard and, 108–109  
 Obvious conditions defense, 265–266  
 Ordinary care, 46  
 Ordinary person standard. *See* Reasonable person standard  
 Pain and suffering. *See also* Nonpecuniary damages  
   disaggregation from loss of enjoyment of life, 386–387  
   overview, 383  
 Paleontology analogy, 1  
 Pecuniary damages, 377–378  
*Per accidens* nuisance, 285–286, 305  
 Perpetuities, 391  
*Per quod* defamation, 305–306, 311  
*Per se* defamation, 305–306, 310, 312, 313  
*Per se* negligence. *See* Negligence *per se*  
*Per se* nuisance, 285–286, 305  
 Personal injuries, moral reasoning approach to tort law and, 21–22  
 Personal property  
   defense of property, 73–75  
   trespass to, 56–58, 272, 273–275  
 Pets, strict liability, 299–300  
 Pharmaceuticals, products liability, 341–343  
 Physical impact rule, 250  
 Physician-patient relationship, “no duty to rescue” rule, 257–258



- Pleasantry exception, 60–61
- Policy, tort law and
  - activity level, 16–19
  - care level, 11–14, 20–24 (*See also* Care level)
  - Coase Theorem, 26–28
  - economic principles, 10–19
  - foreseeability, 231
  - landowners, 268
  - legal positivism, 28, 29–30
  - liability rules, 24–28
  - moral reasoning approach, 20–24 (*See also* Moral reasoning approach to tort law)
  - natural law theory, 28–29, 30–31
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 255–258
  - normative theories, 10
  - overview, 6, 10
  - positive theories, 10
  - products liability, 335–336
  - property rules, 24–28
  - proximate cause, 231
  - sources of tort law, 28–31
  - waiver of tort rights, 422
- Pollock, Charles Edward (Baron), 140–141, 290
- Positive liberty, 254
- Positive theories, 10
- Posner, Richard A., 2, 256, 282, 283
- Potentially negligent conduct as intervening cause, 235–236
- Precaution, factual causation and, 210–212
- Preemption of products liability law, 371–376
  - conflict preemption, 372
  - express preemption, 372
  - field preemption, 372
  - functionalist approach to tort law, 372, 373–374
  - implied preemption, 372
  - medical devices, 374–375
  - motor vehicles, 375–376
  - purpose of, 372–373
  - Wood v. General Motors Corp.*, 372
- Preexisting injury, factual causation, 218–220
- Preponderance of evidence
  - res ipsa loquitur*, 141–142
  - substantial factor test, 205
  - toxic torts, 205
- Present value, 390–393
- Primary assumption of risk
  - overview, 171
  - products liability and, 344
- Privacy, invasion of, 328–329
- Privately optimal activity level, 17
- Privately optimal care level, 12–13, 15–16
- Privilege as defense to defamation, 315–321
  - absolute privilege, 316–319
  - attorneys, absolute privilege, 319
  - intracorporate communication and, 318–319, 329
  - judges, absolute privilege, 319, 329
  - legislators, absolute privilege, 319, 329
  - overview, 304
  - prosecutors, absolute privilege, 319
  - qualified privilege, 320–321, 329–330
  - relationship-based privilege, 318–319
  - spousal privilege and, 318
  - truth, 316–318
- Privity
  - imminent danger to life or health exception, 333–335
  - products liability and, 332–335
- Procedural due process, punitive damages, 411
- Procedural unconscionability, 168
- Products liability
  - activity level and, 335, 346–347
  - administrative costs and, 336
  - alternative equilibrium, 339
  - assumption of risk and, 343–344
  - Barker v. Lull Engineering Co. Inc.*, 362–363
  - blood transfusions, 343
  - breach of duty, 367
  - Brody v. Overlook Hospital*, 343
  - Brown v. Superior Court*, 342
  - business of selling, 341
  - Cafazzo v. Central Medical Health Services, Inc.*, 347–348
  - care level and, 346–347
  - consumer expectations test (*See* Consumer expectations test for products liability)
  - consumption effect, 339–340
  - contributory negligence and, 343
  - defenses, 344–349
  - demand curve (*See* Demand curve, products liability and)
  - design defects, 340, 350–353
  - deterrence and, 335, 346–347
  - Devlin v. Smith*, 334
  - duty, 368
  - economic loss rule as defense, 344–346
  - economics and, 335–336
  - Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno*, 335, 346–347
  - evolution of law, 332–335
  - factual causation, 367
  - foreseeability, 367–368
  - functionalist approach to tort law, 332–333
  - Geier v. American Honda Motor Co.*, 375–376
  - Hood v. Ryobi America Corp.*, 368
  - imminent danger to life or health, 333–335
  - improper defendant defense, 346–349
  - insurance and, 336, 346–347



- Larsen v. General Motors Corp.*, 364–365  
*Linegar v. Armour of America, Inc.*, 361–362, 364  
*MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*, 332, 334–335  
 manufacturing defects, 340, 349–350  
 market equilibrium (See Market equilibrium, products liability and)  
 in medical care context, 341–343, 347–348  
*Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, 374  
*Micallef v. Miehle Co.*, 366  
 misuse of product, 367–368, 370–371  
 nonobvious risks, 364–365, 366  
 obvious and inherent risks, 363–364, 365, 366  
 obvious but not inherent risks, 364, 366  
 overview, 8, 332–335  
 pharmaceuticals, 341–343  
*Phipps v. General Motors Corp.*, 361  
 policy considerations, 335–336  
 preemption of law, 371–376 (See also Preemption of products liability law)  
*Prentis v. Yale Manufacturing Co.*, 360  
 primary assumption of risk and, 344  
 privity and, 332–335  
 proximate cause, 367–368  
*res ipsa loquitur* compared, 336  
 Restatement (Second) of Torts, 340–344  
 retailers, 348–349  
*Riegel v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 375  
 risk allocation and, 333  
 risk spreading and, 336  
 risk-utility test (See Risk-utility test for products liability)  
*Robins Dry Doc & Repair Co. v. Flint*, 345  
*Rylands v. Fletcher*, 342, 349–350  
 secondary assumption of risk and, 343–344  
 Section 402A Comment f, 341  
 Section 402A Comment k, 341–343  
 Section 402A Comment n, 343–344  
 services versus goods, 346  
*Soule v. General Motors Corp.*, 363  
*Statler v. Ray Manufacturing Co.*, 334  
 strict liability, 335–336  
 supply and demand analysis, 337, 339  
 supply curve (See Supply curve, products liability and)  
*Surace v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 360–361  
*Thomas v. Winchester*, 333  
 types of cases, 363–366  
*Volkswagen of America v. Young*, 361  
 warnings, 368–371 (See also Warnings, products liability)  
*Williamson v. Mazda Motor of America Inc.*, 375–376  
*Winterbottom v. Wright*, 332
- Property damage  
 moral reasoning approach to tort law and, 21  
 necessity defense, compensation for property damage, 81  
 Property rules, 26–28  
 Coase Theorem and, 26–28  
 compensatory damages and, 381–382  
 damages and, 381–382  
 liability rules versus, 24–26  
 policy considerations, 24–28  
 punitive damages and, 404–405  
 transaction costs, 25–26  
 trespass and, 24–25  
 Prosecutors, absolute privilege for defamation, 319  
 Prosser, William L.  
 on defamation, 302, 305  
 doctrine and, 2, 3  
 on *res ipsa loquitur*, 143  
 on transferred intent, 54  
 Proximate cause  
*Berry v. Borough of Sugar Notch*, 229–230  
 bystander recovery rule, 251–252  
 contributory negligence and (See Contributory negligence)  
 damages and, 154–157  
 defamation and, 309  
*Dillon v. Legg*, 251–252  
 duty analysis, 247–250  
 emotional injury, 250–252  
 enhanced risk of future injury and, 252–253  
 foreseeability (See Foreseeability)  
 intervening causes and (See Intervening causes)  
 judges, role of, 248–249  
 juries, role of, 248–249  
 legal arguments, 231–232  
 lightning strike hypothetical, 228–229  
 as limitation on scope of liability, 228, 232  
 negligence, 100–101  
 negligence *per se*, 129–130  
 overview, 8, 227  
*Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.*, 247–248, 249–250  
 physical impact rule, 250  
 policy arguments, 231  
 products liability, 367–368  
 rational estimation and, 228–230  
*Ryan v. New York Central Railroad Co.*, 231–232  
*Smithwick v. Hall & Upson Co.*, 229  
 structure of, 230  
*Tuttle v. Atlantic City Railroad Co.*, 250

- Proximate cause (*cont.*)  
 “unforeseeable victim” rule, 247, 248  
*Zokhrabov v. Jeung-Hee Park*, 249–250  
 zone of danger test, 251
- Psychologist-patient relationship, “no duty to rescue” rule, 264–265
- Public disclosure of private facts, 328
- Public figures, defamation of, 323–325
- Public good  
 “no duty to rescue” rule and, 266–267  
 overview, 19  
 truthful information as, 325–326
- Public necessity, 82
- Public officials, defamation of, 321–323
- Public policy exception, assumption of risk, 167–168
- Punitive damages  
 battery, 404  
*BMW v. Gore*, 407–409  
 civil penalties in relation to, 407, 408, 409, 410  
 compensatory damages in relation to, 407, 408, 409, 410–411  
 deterrence and, 401–406, 408–409, 411  
 due process and, 406, 408, 410  
 gain-elimination rationale, 402–403, 404, 405, 407–408  
 intent and, 405  
*Jacque v. Steenberg Homes*, 403–404, 409  
 liability rules and, 404–405  
 loss-internalization rationale, 402, 403, 404, 405–406, 407–408  
 overview, 401–406  
*Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co. v. Haslip*, 408–409  
*Philip Morris v. Williams*, 411  
 predictability, 406–407  
 procedural due process, 411  
 property rules and, 404–405  
 purpose, 401–402, 405  
 recklessness and, 404–405  
 reprehensibility of conduct and, 407, 408, 409, 410  
 single digit ratio, 410–411  
*State Farm v. Campbell*, 409–411  
 substantive due process, 411  
 trespass, 404  
 vicarious liability, 405–406  
 wrongful death, 390
- Pure comparative fault, 171
- Purpose of studying tort law, 4
- Qualified immunity, consent as defense to battery, 64–65
- Qualified privilege as defense to defamation, 320–321, 329–330
- Questions of fact  
 jury, role of, 137  
 mixed questions of law and fact, 137–138  
 overview, 136–137
- Questions of law  
 judge, role of, 137  
 mixed questions of law and fact, 137–138  
 overview, 137
- Rational estimation  
 foreseeability and, 228–230  
 lightning strike hypothetical, 228–229  
 proximate cause and, 228–230
- Rawls, John, 23
- Real property  
 defense of property, 69–73  
 trespass to, 55–56, 271–272
- Reasonable care  
 contributory negligence, 147–148  
 duty, 148–149  
 landowners, 270  
 negligence, 46
- Reasonable cause, false imprisonment, 78
- Reasonable conduct as intervening cause, 233–235
- Reasonable doubt standard, *res ipsa loquitur*, 142
- Reasonable force  
 defense of property, 70, 73, 74  
 false imprisonment, 78  
 self-defense, 68–69
- Reasonable perception  
 defense of property, 73–74  
 false imprisonment, 75–78  
 self-defense, 68–69
- Reasonable person standard  
 administration, 108–109  
 auto accident hypothetical, 103–104  
 blindness, 111  
*Brown v. Kendall*, 102  
 children and minors, 109, 110–111  
 choice of law and, 109  
 contributory negligence, 149–150  
 coordination, 108–109  
 cricket fence hypothetical, 104–106  
 custom and, 123–128 (*See also* Custom, reasonable person standard and)  
 defamation, 307  
 defense of property, 69  
 deterrence, 108–109  
 disability, 109–111  
 economic approach, 103–106, 118–121

- elderly persons, 110
- Golden Rule, 103
- good faith standard versus, 107–108
- Hand Formula versus, 118–121
- heart attacks, 112
- individual capacity, 107–109
- insanity, 111–112
- lex loci* and, 109
- limited duty versus, 107
- maturity, 109–111
- McGuire v. Almy*, 108
- negligence *per se* (See Negligence *per se*)
- “no duty to rescue” rule and, 255
- as objective standard, 108–109
- overview, 29, 102–103, 106
- reliance interest, 107–109
- res ipsa loquitur* and, 145
- risk aversion and, 120–121
- self-defense, 68
- statutes and regulations and, 128–135 (See also Negligence *per se*)
- subjective standard versus, 107–108
- sudden incapacity, 111–112
- United States v. Carroll Towing Co.*, 113, 122
- Vaughan v. Menlove*, 107–109
- Recapture, 35, 36
- Reciprocal exchange of risk
  - landowners and, 268–269
  - nuisance and, 290–291
  - strict liability, 94–95, 96, 97, 99
- Reciprocity as defense to defamation, 304, 312–314, 320
- Recklessness
  - comparative negligence and, 172
  - overview, 85–86
  - punitive damages and, 404–405
- Reflexive conduct
  - intent, 89
  - as intervening cause, 233–235
- Regulations, reasonable person standard and. See Negligence *per se*
- Relationship-based privilege as defense to defamation, 318–319
- Reliance
  - “foreseeability plus,” 242
  - intervening causes, 242
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 261–262
  - reasonable person standard, 107–109
- Reprehensibility of conduct, punitive damages and, 407, 408, 409, 410
- Rescue
  - contributory negligence and, 148–149
  - “no duty to rescue” rule (See “No duty to rescue” rule)
- Res ipsa loquitur*
  - abnormally dangerous activities and, 283
  - baseline probabilities, 139, 140, 142–143
  - Bayes Theorem, 139–140
  - burden of proof, 138–139, 140
  - Byrne v. Boadle*, 138–142
  - common knowledge, 144–145
  - Connolly v. Nicollet Hotel*, 142–143
  - contributory conduct by plaintiff, absence of, 141
  - contributory negligence compared, 150
  - duty of care, 142–143
  - event of kind ordinarily not occurring without negligence, 139–140
  - exclusive control of defendant, instrumentality or agency in, 140–141, 142
  - Galbraith v. Busch*, 143
  - Helling v. Carey*, 139–140
  - informational asymmetry and, 140
  - “information forcing,” 145–146
  - judge and jury, role of, 138
  - Larson v. St. Francis Hotel*, 142–143
  - new technology and, 144
  - overview, 7, 136
  - preponderance of evidence, 141–142
  - products liability compared, 336
  - reasonable doubt standard, 142
  - reasonable person standard and, 145
  - rules, 139–143
  - statistical inference, 139–140
  - substantial factor test compared, 202, 203, 204
  - Wilson v. Colonial Air Transport*, 144
  - Ybarra v. Spangard*, 145–146, 204
- Restatement (First) of Torts, consent as defense, 63
- Restatement (Second) of Torts
  - abnormally dangerous activities, 276, 277–279, 282–283, 303, 311–312
  - consumer expectations test for products liability, 340, 350
  - defense of property, 72
  - false imprisonment, 77
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 264
  - nuisance, 285
  - products liability, 340–344
  - risk-utility test for products liability, 340
  - Section 402A Comment f, 341
  - Section 402A Comment k, 341–343
  - Section 402A Comment n, 343–344
  - trespass, 57
  - warnings, products liability, 370–371
- Restatement (Third) of Torts
  - abnormally dangerous activities, 280
  - risk-utility test for products liability, 363

- Retailers, products liability, 348–349
- Reverse payment settlements, 432–433
- Risk aversion
  - insurance and, 425–426
  - reasonable person standard and, 120–121
  - subrogation and, 425–426
  - vicarious liability, 187, 189
- Risk externalization, 94, 96–97, 99
- Risk spreading, products liability and, 336
- Risk-utility test for products liability
  - both tests, application of, 362–363
  - consumer expectations test compared, 357–360
  - demand curve, 356–357
  - design defects, 351–353
  - direct application of, 360–361
  - economics and, 356–360
  - hybrid test, application of, 361–362
  - implementation of, 360–363
  - incentives and, 359–360
  - inherent unobservable risk and, 358–359
  - market equilibrium, 357
  - negligence, convergence with, 366–368
  - nonobvious risks, 366
  - obvious but not inherent risks, 366
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 340
  - Restatement (Third) of Torts, 363
  - supply curve, 356–357
  - warnings and, 371
- Royal courts, 38–39, 40
- Rules
  - emphasis on, 5–6
  - liability rules (*See* Liability rules)
  - property rules (*See* Property rules)
- Sacks, Oliver, 66
- Sale of tort rights
  - barratry and, 428
  - champerty and, 428
  - maintenance and, 428
  - overview, 423–425
  - to third parties, 426–428
- Schwartz, Gary, 150
- Scientization of tort law, 3
- Seat belt defense cases, 156, 179
- Secondary assumption of risk
  - overview, 171–172
  - products liability and, 343–344
- Self-defense
  - Courvoisier v. Raymond*, 67–69
  - defamation and, 312–313, 320
  - internalization principle and, 69
  - as justification, 67–69
  - Keep v. Quallman*, 67–69
  - reasonable force, 68–69
  - reasonable perception, 68–69
  - reasonable person standard, 68
- Sequential torts
  - Anderson v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.*, 215, 218–220
  - conditional torts, 217
  - cumulative torts, 217–220
  - Dillon v. Twin State Gas & Elec. Co.*, 216
  - enhanced susceptibility to injury, 218, 219, 220
  - factual causation, 215–220
  - independent torts, 216–217
  - Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.*, 215, 218–220
  - Maddux v. Donaldson*, 217
  - preexisting injury, 218–220
  - rooftop hypothetical, 215
  - substantial factor test, 215–220
  - two fires hypothetical, 216
- Settlements
  - damages and, 416–418
  - economic analysis of, 416–418
  - fifty percent tendency, 419–420
  - injunctions versus, 431–433
  - injunctive settlements, 431–432
  - litigation costs, 416–418
  - medical malpractice and, 419–420
  - range of, 417
  - reverse payment settlements, 432–433
  - Spur Industries v. Del E. Webb Development Co.*, 432–433
  - strategic gamesmanship and, 417
  - trial outcome and, 419–420
- Several liability, 180, 181. *See also* Joint and several liability
- Sharkey, Catherine M., 3
- Shaw, Lemuel, 45–46, 102, 136, 160–161, 262–263
- Single digit ratio, punitive damages, 410–411
- Slander, 305–306, 310–311. *See also* Defamation
- Socially optimal activity level, 18
- Socially optimal care level, 12–13, 16
- Social welfare, waiver of tort rights and, 422
- Sources of tort law, 28–31
  - legal positivism, 28, 29–30
  - natural law theory, 28–29, 30–31
- Special damages, defamation, 310
- Specific intent, 90
- Sports, consent as defense to battery, 64–65
- Spousal privilege, defamation and, 318
- Spring guns, defense of property, 70–73
- Sprinkler defense cases, 156, 179
- Statutes, reasonable person standard and. *See* Negligence *per se*

- Strategic gamesmanship
  - overview, 43–44, 45
  - settlements and, 417
- Strict liability
  - abnormally dangerous activities, 275–283 (*See also* Abnormally dangerous activities)
  - activity level and, 18, 95, 97–98
  - act of God exception, 93–94
  - animals and, 298–300
  - benefit externalization, 95–97
  - care level and, 13–14, 16, 97–98
  - Carstairs v. Taylor*, 96–97
  - collateral source rule and, 400
  - compensatory damages, 383
  - contributory negligence and, 155–156
  - damages, 383
  - defamation compared, 303–304
  - discouraging conduct, 98–99
  - dogs, 299–300
  - domestic animals, 299–300
  - functionalist approach, 94–97
  - harm caused by escape, 92
  - implied assumption of risk and, 96
  - incentives for care, 97–98
  - internalization principle and, 49
  - leaving alone, 98–99
  - limited duty versus, 97, 99–101
  - negligence versus, 45, 46–47, 93, 97, 99–101
  - “no duty to rescue” rule and, 256–257
  - nonpecuniary damages, 385–386
  - nuisance (*See* Nuisance)
  - overview, 7, 271
  - Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.*, 100–101
  - pets, 299–300
  - products liability, 335–336
  - reciprocal exchange of risk, 94–95, 96, 97, 99
  - Rickards v. Lothian*, 96
  - risk externalization, 94, 96–97, 99
  - Rylands v. Fletcher*, 7, 8, 91–94, 271, 298–300
  - “Shooting Cases,” 37–38
  - subsidizing conduct, 98–99
  - theoretical foundations, 91
  - Thorns Case*, 35, 36
  - trespass and, 45, 91–92
  - trespass-based strict liability, 271–275 (*See also* Trespass)
    - unreasonable conduct exception, 94
    - waiver of tort rights and, 420–421
    - wild animals, 298
    - zoos, 299
- Subjectivity, reasonable person standard versus, 107–108
- Subrogation
  - barratry and, 428
  - champerty and, 428
  - economic analysis of, 423–425
  - expected value of risk, 425, 426
  - incentives for care and, 424
  - insurance and, 425–426
  - maintenance and, 428
  - overview, 423–425
  - risk aversion and, 425–426
  - third parties, sale of tort rights to, 426–428
- Substantial factor test
  - as alternative test, 198
  - Anderson v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.*, 212–215, 216, 218–220
  - asbestos cases, 205–207
  - Bayes Theorem, 206–207
  - Bostic v. Georgia Pacific*, 205–207
  - burden of proof, 204
  - but-for test compared, 200–201
  - concurrent tortfeasors, 198–199, 213–215
  - conditional torts, 217
  - cumulative torts, 218
  - enhanced susceptibility to injury, 218, 219, 220
  - Haft v. Lone Palm Hotel*, 204
  - independent torts, 216–217
  - inferences, 202
  - intervening causes, 200, 201–202, 203
  - Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.*, 212–215, 216, 218–220
  - lack of precision in, 198
  - “more than doubling” requirement, 205
  - New York Central Railroad Co. v. Grimstad*, 200–201
  - preexisting injury, 218–220
  - preponderance of evidence, 205
  - res ipsa loquitur* compared, 202, 203, 204
  - Reynolds v. Texas & Pacific Ry. Co.*, 201–202
  - sequential torts, 215–220
  - Stubbs v. City of Rochester*, 203, 204
  - toxic torts, 205–207
  - tree diagrams, 199–200, 201–202
  - two fires hypothetical, 212–215
  - types of cases, 198
  - uncertain injury avoidance cases, 199–200
  - uncertain injury causation cases, 201–207
  - Zuchowicz v. United States*, 203–204
- Substantive due process, punitive damages, 411
- Substantive unconscionability, 168
- Sudden incapacity, reasonable person standard, 111–112
- Superior knowledge and control of risk
  - “foreseeability plus,” 242–243
  - intervening causes, 242–243
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 262–267

456

*Index*

- Superseding causes, but-for test, 198
- Supply and demand analysis of products liability, 337, 339
- Supply curve, products liability and
  - overview, 338, 339
  - risk-utility test, 356–357
- Supremacy Clause, conflict preemption, 372
- Taking of property, 84
- Textbooks on tort law, 3
- Toxic torts, substantial factor test, 205–207
- Transaction costs, 25–26
- Transferred intent, battery, 53–54
- Transportation Department, 371, 375–376
- Traynor, Roger, 204, 335, 336
- Trespass
  - ad coelum* rule, 55
  - airplanes, 55–56
  - battery compared, 56
  - Blondell v. Consolidated Gas Co.*, 56–58
  - to chattels, 56–58, 272, 273–275
  - Coase Theorem and, 26–27
  - compensatory damages, 381–382
  - conversion, 272–275
  - damages, 56–58, 381–382
  - direct versus indirect harm, 41–45
  - expansion of writ, 38–41
  - FMC Corp. v. Capital/ABC Inc.*, 273
  - Glidden v. Szybiak*, 56–58
  - Herrin v. Sutherland*, 55
  - injunctions, 430–431
  - intent, 55–56
  - intentional interference with exclusive
    - possession, 271–272
  - legal fictions, 38–39, 40
  - liability rules and, 24–25
  - in manorial courts, 38
  - necessity defense, 35, 79–80
  - negligence and, 45
  - nonpecuniary damages, 385
  - overview, 55
  - to personal property, 56–58, 272, 273–275
  - property rules and, 24–25
  - punitive damages, 404
  - to real property, 55–56, 271–272
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 57
  - in royal courts, 38–39, 40
  - Scott v. Shepherd*, 41–43
  - “Shooting Cases,” 37–38
  - strict liability and, 45, 91–92, 271–275
  - Thorns Case*, 33–36, 38
  - trespass on the case, 40–45
  - volitional conduct, 89
  - writ of, 33
- Trespassers
  - landowner duties to, 267–268, 269
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 257
- Truth as defense to defamation, 316–318
- Truthful information as public good, 325–326
- Ultrahazardous activities. *See* Abnormally dangerous activities
- Unborn children, consent as defense to battery, 63
- Unconsciousability
  - assumption of risk, 168
  - procedural unconscionability, 168
  - substantive unconscionability, 168
  - waiver of tort rights, 420, 422
- “Unforeseeable victim” rule, 247, 248
- Unreasonable conduct exception, strict liability, 94
- Unusually sensitive plaintiffs
  - abnormally dangerous activities, 277
  - contributory negligence, 156–157
  - defamation and, 309
  - direct causation, 246
  - nuisance, 291–292
- Utilitarian approach to tort law
  - defamation, 310–311, 323, 325
  - legal positivism, 29–30
  - “no duty to rescue” rule, 256–257
  - nuisance, 288, 290–291, 293, 294, 295
  - overview, 1, 2
  - vicarious liability, 186
- Utility, damages and, 379–383
- Vertically related tortfeasors, 187–188
- Vicarious liability
  - assumption of risk, 162
  - “borrowed servants,” 188–189
  - charitable immunity compared, 193–194
  - direct negligence of employer, 191–193
  - employment cases, 184–185
  - fellow servant rule compared, 162, 191–192
  - as form of joint and several liability, 187–189
  - frolic and detour, 192–193
  - indemnification of employer, 189
  - independent contractors, 190–191
  - intentional torts, 185–186
  - judgment-proof employee problem, 186, 189
  - manner, means, and details test, 190
  - overview, 7
  - potential liability of employee, 189
  - punitive damages, 405–406
  - risk aversion, 187, 189
  - within scope of employment, 192
  - upstream and downstream settings, 187–188

- utilitarian approach to tort law, 186
  - vertically related tortfeasors, 187–188
- View, obstruction of as nuisance, 292–294
- Volitional conduct, 89
- Wade, John W., 352, 353, 360–361
- Waiver of tort rights
  - arbitration, 422–423
  - assumption of risk and, 166–169
  - class actions, 423
  - damages and, 420–423
  - economic analysis of, 420–423
  - litigation costs and, 420–423
  - policy considerations, 422
  - social welfare and, 422
  - strict liability and, 420–421
  - unconscionability, 420, 422
- Warnings, products liability, 368–371
  - behavioral psychology and, 371
  - burden-benefit test, 369–370
  - contributory negligence, 370–371
  - discounting of warnings, 369–370
  - factual causation, 370
  - heeding presumption, 370
  - inadequate warnings, 369
  - misuse of product, 370–371
  - negligence, 368–369
  - overview, 341
  - Restatement (Second) of Torts, 370–371
  - risk-utility test and, 371
- Wigmore, John Henry, 3–5, 139–143
- Wild animals, strict liability, 298
- Willful, wanton or reckless conduct
  - assault, 86–87 (*See also* Assault)
  - battery, 85
  - comparative negligence and, 172
  - damages, 86
  - differences between, 85–86
  - examples, 85
  - intentional infliction of emotional distress, 87–88 (*See also* Intentional infliction of emotional distress)
  - overview, 84–86
  - punitive damages and, 404–405
  - recklessness, 85–86, 172, 404–405
- Woodward, C. Vann, 322–323
- Workers' compensation
  - custom and, 123
  - fellow servant rule, effect on, 163
- Wrongful death, 390–396
  - annuities, 391
  - calculation of damages, 392, 394–395
  - children and minors, 395–396
  - compensatory damages, 390
  - expected present value, 393–394
  - income increases and, 393
  - jurisdiction, 390
  - overview, 390
  - perpetuities, 391
  - present value, 390–393
  - punitive damages, 390
- Zone of danger test, 251
- Zoos, strict liability, 299