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harm against 280
system of work for police
operations 100
vicarious liability 967
Poole BC v GN 664
precautions see reasonable
precautions
pregnancy, immunity from duty of
care during 122–24
prescription, right of 894–95
primary victims of psychiatric harm
see psychiatric harm
prison service, failure to control,
supervise or detain 150–51
prisons
confine ment in, for prevention of
crime, disorder, or ill-discipline
729–30
duty of care 50
privacy, misuse of private information 5
private nuisance
abatement 8
abatement of 911–12
abnormal sensitivity 887–89
actionable/non-actionable
interferences 851–55
‘acts of God’ defence 898
analytical approach to 833
balancing exercise, relevant factors
863–72
‘but-for’ test 881–82
capacity to be sued 842–48
capacity to sue 9, 835
causation
‘but-for’ test 881–82
damage to land or to interest in
land 880–81
generally 880
cause of action 833–35
‘coming to the nuisance’ 872–74
‘common enemy’ doctrine 897
compensatory damages for
899–906
contributory negligence 898–99
costs of litigation 835
damage, remoteness of 882–89
damage to land or to interest in
land 880–81
damages in lieu of injunction
909–11
defences 899–912
definition of 833
estopped by acquiescence 897
exclusionary rule as to damages
884–86
foreseeability of damage 882–84
Human Rights Act 1998
damages 913–14
generally 912
proof of violation 912–13
independent contractor/non-
delegable duty defence 896
injunctions 906–9
intangible interferences 851
interests protected by tort of 8
interference with use and
enjoyment of land
emanation 858–61
isolated interferences; or state of
affairs 856–57
types of interferences 850–56
litigation costs 835
physical interference 862–63
prerequisites for tort 835–49
prescription, right of 894–95
remedies for 899–912
remoteness of damage
abnormal sensitivity 887–89
exclusionary rule 884–86
reasonable foreseeability 882–84
type of damage 882–84
Rylands v Fletcher liability 949–51
statutory authorisation 889–93
threshold principle 848–49
unreasonable user 861
volenti 898–99

privilege
absolute privilege 824–25
qualified
common law 818–20
statutory 821–22
Reynolds v Times Newspapers see
public interest
therapeutic privilege
applicability of 535–36
caveats to 539
elements of 536–39
foregoing of treatment 537
professional guidance on
537–38
peer professional opinion,
minority professional opinion,
peer-reviewed statements,
validly held decision to withhold
information about material risk
of treatment, requirement for
538–39
see also absolute privilege
probability see balance of
probabilities
professionals
(in)experience in (non-)professional
activities, effect on standard of
care 305–11
absence of body of peer
professional opinion 376–78
Bolam test as to specialists 292–99
conflicting professional opinions,
validity for Bolam test 364–66
defamation 775–78
experienced surgeons, standard
of care 308
matters not requiring ‘expert
judgment’, exclusion from
Bolam test 379–81
minority professional opinion,
validity for Bolam test 363–64
peer professional opinion, Bolam/
Bolitho test 359–81
peer-reviewed statements,
defamation and 806–7
reliance on professional guidelines,
Bolam test and 367
superiority analysis as to
conflicting opinions 365–66
see also doctors; general
practitioners
property
duty of reasonable care to protect 148
see also damage to property; occupiers’ liability proprietors see owners
Protection from Harassment Act 1997, tort of harassment 5, 9
provocation, trespass to the person 737–39
proximity
Anns v Merton LBC causual 63
concept of 62
duty of care to children 658–59
economic loss claims, relevance to see economic loss
elevated primary victims of psychiatric harm 276
failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 157
fear-of-the-future claimants 278
foreseeability equated with geographic 157
geographical 62
gravity of harm, and 65–72
immigration, public authority duty of care 672
psychiatric injury claims, relevance to 246–49
and public authority liability 657–73
relational 63, 158, 255–57
spatial 257–61
stressed-at-work claims 287
temporal 62, 157, 257–61
types of 62–63
PSLA damages see damages
psychiatric harm
analytical approach for 218–20
de minimis principle and 222
diagnostic classifications 222–26
egg-shell skull claims 499–500, 501–2
elevated primary victims
analytical approach to 219
definition of
duty of care requirements 275–77
normal fortitude rule 276–77
proximity requirement 276
and reasonable foreseeability test 276
scenarios 239–41

shock requirement 277
English law reform 226
exclusions from diagnosis 224–25
fear-of-the-future claimants
analytical approach to 219, 241–42
and Caparo test 277
definition of
duty of care requirements 277–79
non-inclusion as primary victims 235–36
normal fortitude rule 277–78
proximity requirement 278
public policy factors as to duty of care 279–80
reasonable foreseeability test 277–78
guilt-ridden primary victims
category of 232–33
employees involved in workplace accidents/mishaps with fellow employees 233
parents whose children were sexually abused 232
proximity 247–48
Wagon Mound principle 246
immediate aftermath
document in Alcock v CC of South Yorkshire Police 257–58
duration of 257
exceptions to doctrine 259–61
law reform 261
physical and temporal proximity requirements 258–59
introduction to 215
judicial uncertainties 215
law reform 215–16
legal complexities 215–17
lesser mental injury ‘tagged’ onto physical injury 225–26
mental injury, pure or consequential 217–18
non-liability, reasons for 220–21
and ‘normal fortitude’ rule
egg-shell skull claims 499–500
inapplicability of 250–52
law reform 251–52
secondary victims and 266–67
Page v Smith 244
as personal injury 217–18
practical considerations 216–17
preconditions for pure psychiatric injury 218
primary victims
also as secondary victims 273–75
analytical approach to 218
change in definition of 227–29
as claimants 244
definition of
duty-of-care requirements 244
normal fortitude rule 250–52
persons excluded from status of 233–36
proximity 246–49
public policy factors as to duty of care 249–50
reasonable foreseeability test 244–46
secondary victims compared with 274–75
shock requirement 252–54
types of 249
property damage and 218
prospect of 537
proximity, primary victims 246–49
public policy factors as to duty of care
primary victims 249–50
recognisable psychiatric injury as precondition 221
‘pure psychiatric injury,’ definition of 217
reasonable foreseeability test
Page v Smith 244
primary victims 244–46
Scottish law reform 246
recognisable psychiatric injury as pre-condition 220–26
recognised psychiatric injury
diagnostic classifications 222–26
exclusions 224–25
Ipp Committee proposals 226
law reform 226
‘tagging’ of lesser mental injury onto a physical injury 225–26
threshold principle 220–22
totem of damages 221–22
rescuers, non-inclusion as primary victims 233–35
residuary claimants
analytical approach to 219
arising of 279
assumption of responsibility/reliance test 279, 281–82
definition of
duty of care requirements 281–82
examples of 279–80
Index

and negligent misstatement 279
reasonable foreseeability test 281
scenarios 242
Scottish law reform
reasonable foreseeability test 246
threshold damage 226
secondary victims
also as primary victims 273–75
analytical approach to 219
definition of 236–37
direct perception of accident, requirement for 261–66
duty of care requirements 254–75
duty of care to, not derived from duty owed to primary victim 237–38
and immediate aftermath
doctrine 257–58
and ‘normal fortitude’ rule 266–67
physical injury 236–38
primary victims compared with 274–75
property damage and 238–39
proximity of relationship 257–61
reasonable foreseeability 254–55
scenario 237
shock, requirement for 268–73
spatial proximity 257–61
temporal proximity 257–61
shock requirement
elevated primary victims 277
primary victims 252
stressed-at-work claimants
analytical approach to 219
definition of 286–87
proximity requirement 287
rest of cause of action 287
scenarios 243
ways of claiming 283–84
threshold damage, law reform 226
type of claimant as precondition 226, 43–44
Wagon Mound principle 246
zone-of-danger primary victims
car accident, negligent driving 230
child’s death or injury at birth, medical negligence 230
mother’s death in pregnancy or childbirth, medical negligence 230
in vicinity of violent person or violent act 231
workplace accident or incident, employer negligence 230
psychiatric injury see psychiatric harm
public authorities
analytical approach to liability 640
ancillary causes of action 639–40
breach of duty of care 354
breach of statutory duty, and 639–40
Caparo Industries plc v Dickman 655–74
children, duty of care owed to 655–74
‘Common Good,’ responsibility for 650–55
definition of 22, 638
duty of care
Anns v Merton LBC, two-stage test arising of 649
Barrett v Enfield LBC 659
Bedfordshire cases 657
Caparo Industries plc v Dickman 655–74
children 655–74
to claimant over ‘Common Good’ 650–55
educational services 669
establishment of 649
immigration matters 671
incidental duty 675
JD v East Berkshire Community Health NHS Trust 661
‘making it worse’ principle 649–50
Poole BC v GN 664
proprietors of deregistered business 672
proximity and public policy 657–73
reasonable foreseeability 656–57
East Suffolk Rivers Catchment Board v Kent
general principle as to liability 640–43
reasons for principle 642–43
timeline of two-stage test 644
and Wednesday test 643–46
ECHR and
Article 6 and 676–78
harmonisation of common law 679–81
strike-out procedure 678–79
taking actions to ECHR 675–76
timeline of important events 677–78
educational services, duty of care 669
exemplary damages claims against 571
foreseeability of damage 656–57
immigration matters, duty of care 671
liability
analytical approach to 640
ancillary causes of action 639–40
direct or vicarious liability 639
duty of care 649–75
East Suffolk Rivers Catchment Board v Kent 640–46
European Convention on Human Rights 675–81
introduction to 638
policy/operational distinction 640, 46–47
‘pure omissions’ principle 647–48
unenacted law reform 681–82
‘making it worse’ rule 649–50
misfeasance in public office 965
policy and operational considerations, distinction between 464–47
proprietors of deregistered business,
duty of care owed to 672
proximity and public policy 657–73
‘pure omissions’ principle 647–48
reasonable foreseeability of damage 656–57
responsibility to claimant over ‘Common Good’ 650–55
vicarious liability 639
public interest
Defamation Act 2013, s 4 810
elements of defence 811
fact or opinion 817
‘legitimate interest’ test 823–24
matters of 812–16
objective reasonable belief 816–17
replacement of Reynolds defence 810
reportage and 823–24
Reynolds defence 811–12
public policy (relating to duty of care) 65–70
administration of justice 81
ambulance service 89–90
Anns v Merton LBC 66
‘Bad Samaritan’ liability 90, 101–6
‘battle conditions’ 70, 101
Caparo tripartite test 66
causation and 402–3
causation problems 103
children
duty of care owed by very young children 72–73
duty of care to 658–59
pupils 671
compromise of liberty or altruism 69
crime of duties 68, 88, 89, 93
corrective justice 67, 79, 80, 90, 108
danger, unjustifiable imposition of 103
defensive practices 67, 88, 92, 101, 110
disproportionate liability problem 70, 75
distributive justice 67, 76, 79, 81, 108
diversion of resources 67, 92
doctors and see doctors
emergency services 86–89
equal treatment in imposition of duty 69, 101, 110
exemplary damages 574–76
expenditure, unjustifiable imposition of 103
failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 160–65
fairness and 65–70
feared-of-the-future claimants 279
‘floodgates’ concerns as to claims 67, 79, 88, 92
general principles 65–72
‘Good Samaritan’ liability 108–9
immigration, public authority liability 672
immunity from duty, creation of 70–71
‘incalculables problem’, the 69, 75, 81
‘indefinite liability problem’ 68, 103
and individual liberty 103
individual subordinated to public good 93
individual subordinated to wider public good 70
insurability and 110
insurance, (non)availability of 71–72
justice and 65–70
lacuna in remedy 70
liberty/altruistic motives, compromise of 103
matter for Parliament rather than courts 69, 93
‘no-need’ reasoning 68, 76, 80, 93
parents wrongfully accused of sexually or physically abusing their children 665
personal injury has priority over economic loss 69, 110
police forces 90–101
primary victims of psychiatric harm 249–50
proprietors of deregistered business 672
protection of the public 69
proximity and public authority liability 657–73
psychiatric harm claims 221, 249–50
public authority policy and operational considerations, distinction between 640, 46–647
reasonableness and 65–70
recognised psychiatric injury 221
referees in sports contests 109–10
remoteness and 512–13
rescuers 108
‘satellite litigation’ problem 70
‘what would it achieve?’ reasoning 69, 93
‘why pick on me?’ argument 103
wrongful birth claims 82–86
wrongful conception claims 74–82
wrongful life claims 125
publications, peer-reviewed
statements, defamation and 806–7
punitive damages see exemplary damages
pure economic loss see economic loss
pure omissions see omissions
pure psychiatric injury see psychiatric harm
qualified privilege
common law privilege 818–20
statutory privilege 821–22
ratio decidendi principle 21
reasonable expectation test 31
reasonable foreseeability see foreseeability
‘reasonable patient’ test
Australian law compared 134
Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board 131–34
subjectively significant risks, disclosure of 139–40
reasonable precautions
occupiers’ liability 611–14
other occupiers’ practice 614–15
post-accident steps 395–96, 614
reasonable user see private nuisance
reasonableness, public policy as to duty of care 65–70
recovery, exemplary damages 573
referees (sport), standard of care towards participants 323–25
references, negligent misstatements in 188–90
relationships, relational proximity 257–61
reliance
change of position 116–17
detrimental or non-detrimental 116–18
knowledge of 119
limited 118–19
no change of position 117–18
proof of 116
reasonable 118
religion, patient’s religious/cultural concerns as to medical treatment, awareness of 141
remedies
aggravated damages 567–69
availability across torts 8
compensatory damages 544–66
exemplary damages 569–76
injunctive relief 543
introduction to 543–44
nominal damages 576–77
occupiers’ liability 637
restitutionary damages 577–78
Index

remoteness
- analytical approach to 488–89
- and causal links 511–12
- of damage 17
- damage categories 489–99
- of damages 221–22
- egg-shell skull claims 499–503
- failure-to-warn scenarios and 510–11
- foreseeability, and 52, 490–97
- issues addressed by remoteness enquiry 487–88
- occupiers’ liability 627
- Occupiers’ Liability Act 1957 627
- Polemis, Re 489–90
- private nuisance, damage from 882–89
- public policy as to 512–13
- purposes of remoteness enquiry 487
- reasonable foreseeability, concept of 53, 490–97
- Rylands v Fletcher liability 942–44
- Wagon Mound No 1 489–90
- see also direct perception requirement

reportage
- Defamation Act 2013, s 4(3) 822
- elements of defence 823
- legitimate public interest 823–24
- ‘neutral reporting’ concept 823

res ipsa loquitur
- accident not normally occurring in absence of negligence, as criterion 390–91
- application of 386–87
- burden of proof 391–93
- causation and 393
- and complex procedures 387
- and disputed expert evidence 387
- effect of 384–85
- exclusive control criterion 388–89
- incontrovertible facts criteria 387–88
- and lack of control over object/instrument 389
- meaning of 384–85
- and multiple defendants 388–89
- no plausible innocent explanation, as criterion 389–90
- other jurisdictions compared 394
- rationale for 384–85
- rebuttal of 386–87
- reliance on 384

sole control criterion 388–89
- and technically complex procedures 387
- terminology 386
- uncertainties as to 393
- rescuers
- duty of care owed to 53, 106–8
- ‘easy rescue’ principle 103–4
- necessity and 542
- non-inclusion as primary victims of psychiatric harm 233–35
- public policy factors as to duty of care 108
- resources, diversion of police resources in duty of care litigation 92
- responsibility, comparative
  - responsibility in contributory negligence 522–24
- restitutionary damages
  - definition of 10, 577
- distinction between proprietary and non-proprietary torts 578
- non-award for negligence 577
- policy objectives 577
- Reynolds v Times Newspapers see public interest
- rights, in personam protection under tort law 15

risk
- appreciation of 527–28
- comparative risks, disclosure of 137
- ‘doubling the risk’ theorem see causation
- essential or elective medical procedures 137–38
- failure to take precautions against risk of agent causing harm 421
- highest possible level of proof is breach of duty of care materially increased risk of harm 422
- inherent risk, failure to remove 396–97
- inherent risks, non-disclosure of 129–30
- non-obvious risks, occupiers’ liability and 618
- objective appreciation of 529
- objectively significant risks
  - Australian law compared 134
  - comparative risks 137
- definition of 130
- in English law 131–39
- essential or elective medical procedures 137–38
- factors for existence of 135–39
- gravity of injury if risk manifests 135–36
- ‘peer professional opinion’ test (Bolam) 131–34, 136
- physician’s experience of 138
- probability of injury occurring 135
- ‘reasonable patient’ test
  - obvious risks, occupiers’ liability 103–4
- warnings in medical booklets/literature 138–39
- obvious risks, occupiers’ liability and 616–19
- physician’s experience of 138
- sports, appreciation of risks 528
- subjective appreciation of 529
- subjectively-significant risks
  - additional factors 141–42
  - indicators of 139
  - patient’s aversion to operative procedures 141
  - patient’s historical experiences 141
  - patient’s irrational belief giving rise to extreme anxiety 141
  - patient’s religious/cultural concerns 141
  - pre-existing medical conditions 141
  - relevance of known physical or mental characteristics of patient 140–42
  - relevance of questions as to 139–40
  - special needs of patient’s family 141
- validly held decision to withhold information about material risk of treatment 538–39
- volenti and appreciation of risks 528
- warnings in medical booklets/literature 138–39
- road safety, public authority liability and 653
- road users
  - ‘agony of the moment’ scenarios 313–14
road users (cont.)
  duty of care 49, 52, 145–46
  foreseeability test, and 52
Rookes v Barnard 569
rules, contravention of, as test of breach of duty of care 382
rural areas, ‘locality rule’ and standard of care 316–18
Rylans v Fletcher liability accidental escapes 912
act of God 944–45
act of vis major 945
actionable torts, need for proof of damage 8
acts of strangers 945–47
arising of 918
capacity to be sued 922–23
capacity to sue 9, 921–22
causation 942–44
consent defence 948
contributory negligence 949
defences 944–49
definition and statement of 915–16
deliberate accumulation 933–34
duty of care, breach of non-delegable 951–52
escape of a dangerous thing 923–32
escape of fire
scenario 928–29
statutory regime 955–59
fault or strict liability, whether 8
and Fires Prevention (Metropolis) Act 1774 958–59
history of 918–21
intentional escapes 912
interests protected in 9
knowledge of escape 930–32
law reform 954–55
mischief or danger test 929–30
natural user of land
916–37
‘no encroachment’ scenarios 926–28
‘no escape’ scenarios 925–26
non-natural user of land
  dramatic change of use 934–35
  modern articulation and application of test 935–42
other actions in relation 949–52
prerequisites for tort 921–23
private nuisance and 949–51
proposed replacement of tortious action under 12
remedies in 955
remoteness of damage 942–44
retention of
Australian view 953–54
English view 952–53
law reform 954–55
statutory scheme instead of 956
statutory authorisation, defence of 949–52
statutory scheme instead of 955
strict liability or fault, whether 8
as strict liability tort 916–18
vis major, act of 945
volenti 949
SAAMCO see South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd
safety at work see vicarious liability
Salmond test see vicarious liability
SARAH Act 2015 see Social Action, Responsibility and Heroism Act 2015
schools see educational services
Scottish law
defamation 767
direct perception of accident, requirement for 266
immediate aftermath doctrine 261
inexperienced surgeons, standard of care 308
‘normal fortitude’ rule 252, 266, 287
reasonable foreseeability test 246
relational proximity 257
shock requirement for psychiatric harm 253, 273
threshold damage as to psychiatric injury 226
search engines, defamation and 793–95
secondary victims of psychiatric harm see psychiatric harm
self-defence
assault and battery and right of 11
trespass to the person 732–34
shock see psychiatric harm
slander
as crime or tort 759
definition of 753
establishment of 752–59
law reform 753
libel distinguished from 753
publishers of 791
when actionable 757
smoking, pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care 122
Social Action, Responsibility and Heroism Act 2015 (SARAH Act 2015) 375
social housing
landlords’ failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 153–54
public authority liability for homeless persons 654
social services for neglected and abused children, duty of care 657
solicitors, defamatory publications 790
South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd (SAAMCO)
applicability of SAAMCO principle 507
limitations of SAAMCO principle 509–10
SAAMCO principle described 507–8
‘scope of duty’ enquiry 505
Spartan Steel and Alloys Ltd v Martin & Co (Contractors) Ltd 207–11
sport
amateur referees’ duty of care 109
Capuro tripartite test for duty of care 109
pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care 122
public policy factors as to duty of care 110
standard of care
‘agony of the moment’ scenarios 115
participants toward participants 321–23
participants towards spectators 318–21
promoters towards spectators/participants 325
reasons for suppressed standard 320–21, 322
referees towards participants 323–25
variations in standard 323, 325–26
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volenti and appreciation of risks 528
standard of care (in)experience in (non-)professional activities, effect of 305–11
age of children, effect of 299–302
‘agonys of the moment’ scenarios ambulance service 314
emergencies for road-users 313–14
emergency services scenarios 314–15
fire services 315
general practitioners 315
Good Samaritan interventions 313
police forces 315
principles of 312–13
scenarios 313
sport and recreation 315
suppressed standard of care 312
analytical approach to 288, 291
Australia 297
available resources and facilities, effect of 326–12
average standard 290
awareness of disability 304–5
Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee 292–99
child’s behaviour as factor in application of suppressed standard of care 302
circumstances, effect of 311–32
concurrent liability in contract and tort 18
damage to adjoining landowners 327–29
‘diagnosis with a focus’ scenarios 316
disability (physical or mental), effecton 302–5
duty to refer, ‘locality rule’ and 296
escape of fire 328
escape of floodwaters onto land 329
escape of mosquitoes 329
graduated specialisms, effect of 292–96
health authorities, limited availability of resources 330–32
Ireland 297, 301
judicial uncertainty as to 296–97
justifications for Nettleship/Wilsher rules 306–7
landowners, damage to adjoining 327–29
law reform 301, 308
‘locality’ rule as to rural/country environments
failure to refer 317–18
limited applicability of 316
principles of 317
loss of support for land 329
Nettleship v Weston 305
non-awareness of disability 303–4
objective standard, exceptions to 290–92
objective standard for children 301–2
occupiers’ liability see occupiers’ liability
personal characteristics, impact of 292–311
professions and specialisms, effect of 292–99
reasonableness standard 288–89
requisite legal standard 288–89
sport and recreation
‘agonys of the moment’ scenarios 315
participants toward participants 321–23
participants towards spectators 318–21
promoters towards spectators/ participants 325
reasons for suppressed standard 320–21, 322, 333
referees towards participants 323–25
variations in standard 323, 325–26
subjective standard for children 301–2
suppressed standard for children 299–302
‘team standard’ 290
unattainable standard, lawfulness of 289
Wilsher v Essex AHA 305
difficulties with 309–11
health authorities, limited availability of resources 332
impact of 307–8
standards, contravention of, as test of breach of duty of care 382
standing to sue
associations 768
companies 768
defamation 766–69
governmental authorities, capacity to sue 766–68
partnerships, capacity to sue 768
private nuisance 9, 835
public authorities, capacity to sue 766–68
restrictions on 9
Rylands v Fletcher liability 9, 921–22
Rylands v Fletcher rule 9
trade unions, capacity to sue 769
unborn claimants 61–62
statistical evidence of causation 414
statutory authorisation see authorisation
statutory compensation schemes
features of 12–15
proposed replacement of Rylands v Fletcher tort action 12
stressed-at-work claimants 284–86
tortious compensation as alternative 12–15
sterilisations, failed see wrongful conception
strangers see third parties
stressed-at-work claimants of psychiatric harm see occupational stress
stressed-at-work claims see psychiatric harm
strict (no-fault) liability fault and 8
Rylands v Fletcher rule 8
striking out applications 24–26
ECHR and public authority liability 678–79
subject matter, defamation 761
subjectively significant risk see risk
survival action by deceased’s estate see death
systemic breach see breach of duty of care

talem qualem (as he finds him) see egg-shell skull
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Tarasoff doctrine 164
testamentary dispositions see wills
third parties
acts of strangers, as defence 635–646
failure to control, supervise or detain
capacity to warn or protect 156
compensation, means of 164–165
conflict of duties and interests 162–163
degree of control 155–156
not a derivative duty 149–150
diversion of police resources in duty of care litigation 162
European Convention on Human Rights 165–166
health authorities/practitioners 152
implication of duty for other cases/sectors 165
incremental test 165
knowledge of propensities 156–157
lack of control of dangerous persons 148–149
leading cases 150–154
leading cases, analysis of 154–166
member of identifiable class at special risk 159–160
omission to act 161
practical problems of imposing duty to warn 161–162
prior knowledge of at-risk person’s identity 158
prison officers 150–151
proximity, relational 158
proximity, temporal and geographic 157
proximity factors summarised 160
public policy factors as to duty of care 160–165
reasonable foreseeability of harm 154–155
requisite proximity 155–160
schools 151–152
size of class of at-risk persons 163–164
social housing landlords 153–154
successful cases 153
Tarasoff Doctrine 164
unsuccessful cases 154
intervening acts
conduct neither negligent nor criminal 464–465
criminal or negligent acts 463–464
time arising of public authority’s duty of care 649
date for assessing breach 339–342
immediate aftermath doctrine see psychiatric harm
temporal proximity 257–261
time-frames of pain and suffering 553
tort(s)
actionable torts, need for proof of damage 8, 403–8
as alternative to statutory compensation 12–15
alternatives to tort actions 16
apportionment of risk as function of 12
assault see assault
Baker v Willoughby and successive tortfeasors
balancing of competing rights 11
battery see battery
champery 2
compensatory function 10, 15–17
concurrence actions, Keegan v CC of Merseyside and 16
concurrence liability with contract 17
conspiracy to injure 965
contract law apportionment of risk 12
contractor’s authorised or ratified tort 3004
definition of 1
deterrent function 10–11
disparities among 8–9
false imprisonment see false imprisonment
‘gap-filling’ role 12
limitation period 18
litigation 21–32
misfeasance in public office 965
monetary compensation under 15–17
non-proprietary and proprietary torts distinguished 578
non-tortious reasons for supervening acts would have led to same damage 483–484
in personam protection of rights 15
proprietary and non-proprietary torts distinguished 578
public vindication as function of 11–12
purposes of tort law 9–15
range of 1–7
sources of law 21–22
successive tortfeasors, Baker v Willoughby and
trespass to the person see trespass to the person
trade unions, capacity to sue for defamation 769
‘transferred loss’ principle, rejection of 211–12
transport operators, duty of care 49
trespass to chattels 6
trespass to land 6
trespass to the person actions on the case, distinction from 685–687
aggravated damages 742–44
ancillary actions 687–88
assault see assault
battery see battery
compensatory damages 739–42
consent defence 711
contributory negligence 734–37
defences 711–39
defined 7
exemplary damages 744–46
false imprisonment see false imprisonment
introduction to 685
necessity defence
ECHR and 727–28
generally 719
law reform 725
medical treatment 719–25
statutory ‘bests interests’ defence 725–726
prevention of crime, disorder, or ill-discipline
imminent breach of the peace 731–32
lawful application of force or restraint 728
parental authority over children 730–731
powers of arrest or detention 728
prison confinement 729–730
provocation defence 737–39
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remedies 739–48  
self-defence, defence of 732–34  
types of torts 685  
vindicatory damages 746–48  
trespassers  
allurement, doctrine of 601–2  
categorisation as 597  
duty of care toward 629–32  
occupiers’ duty of care towards 9, 145, 628–34  
occupiers’ liability towards 596–603  
standard of care towards 632–34  
upgraded to visitor status 601–3  
visitor downgraded to status of 598–601  
trover 3  
truth  
Defamation Act 2013, s 2 802  
elements of defence 803  
imputation of fact 803  
substantially true imputations 803–6  

unborn children  
duty of care under 1976 Act 59–61  
‘occurrence’ of injuries, events leading to 58  
standing to sue 61–62  
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