

Index

- abatement
 private nuisance 911–12
 as self-help remedy 8
see also private nuisance
- absolute privilege 824–25
- abuse of judicial process 2
- accident and emergency (A&E)
 services *see* medical services
- accident victims, duty of care toward
 rescuers 53
- accidents
 accidental escapes 932
 ‘inevitable accidents’
 arising of 342
 burden of proof 343
 definition of 342–43
 not normally occurring in absence
 of negligence 390–91
 post-accident precautions 395–96,
 614
- accumulations, *Rylands v Fletcher*
 liability 933–34
- acquiescence
 to defamatory publication 825
 estoppel by 897
- act of God
 private nuisance 898
Rylands v Fletcher liability 944–45
- act of *vis major* 945
- actions/acts
 actions on the case, trespass to the
 person distinguished from
 685–87
 acts of strangers, as defence 635,
 945–47
 ancillary actions
 defamation 752–59
 trespass to the person 687–88
- and pure omissions 143–45
- administration of justice, public
 policy and 81
- aggravated damages
 applicability of 567
 compensatory character of
 567
 defamation 830–31
- Alcock v CC of South Yorkshire Police*
 257–58
- alcohol abuse, pregnant mother’s
 immunity from duty of care
 122
- allocation/apportionment of damages
see damages
- allurement, doctrine of 601–2
- ambulance service
 ‘agony of the moment’ scenarios
 314
 and ‘Bad Samaritan’ rule 90
 conflict of duties and interests 89
 different legal position from other
 emergency services 89
 duty of care 89–90
 public policy factors as to duty of
 care 89
- amends *see* offer of amends
- amenity, loss of *see* pain and suffering
- Anns v Merton LBC*
 and public policy as to duty of care
 66
 two-stage test of duty of care 40
- ‘antidote’ to ‘bane’ *see* defamation
- apologies, as remedy 543
- apportionment of risk
 contract law 12
 tort law 12
- arrest, powers of 728
- assault
 actions on the case, distinction
 from 685
 analytical approach to 688–89,
 695–98
 ancillary actions 688
 battery distinguished from 688
 definitions of 2
 infliction of force 696–97
 intention 696–97
 requisite apprehension 698
 requisite capacity 697–98
 right of self-defence 11
 ‘transferred malice’ doctrine 697
 transferred malice doctrine 695
 vicarious liability 965
- Associated Provincial Picture Houses
 Ltd v Wednesbury Corp* *see*
Wednesbury test
- associations, capacity to sue for
 defamation 768
- assumption of responsibility
 application of 46
 arising of 112–16
Caparo tripartite test, and 45
 controlled, certified, or regulated
 activities 114
 disclaimers of 116
 duty of care, and
 emergency services 115–16
 enforcement of safety rules or
 regulations 114–15
*Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller &
 Partners Ltd* 111
 of instructors 112–13
 proof of 111
 proof of reliance 116
 relationships of dependency 113

1012 Index

- assumption of responsibility (*cont.*)
 residuary claimants of psychiatric harm 279, 281–82
 of teachers 112–13
see also reliance; volenti
- audited statements, negligent misstatements in 184–87
- Australia
 ‘bad Samaritan’ liability 106
 contributory negligence 517
 failed sterilisations, recoverable costs 75–76
 failure-to-warn cases 457
 false imprisonment 701
 objectively significant risks, ‘reasonable patient’ test for 134
 pure relational economic loss 213–14
 quantification of exemplary damages 574
Rylands v Fletcher liability 953–54
 ‘scope of duty’ enquiry 511
 standard of care 297
 statutory apology 544
 wrongful life claims 126–27
- authorisation, statutory 889–93, 949
- ‘bad Samaritan’ liability
 Australian law compared 106
 bystanders’ duty of care 101
 ‘easy rescue’ principle 103–4
 examples of ‘unhelpful strangers’ 102
 exceptions to no duty of care 104–5
 general proposition as to 101
 public policy factors as to duty of care 90, 103
 and ‘pure omissions’ rule 104
- Baker v Willoughby*
- balance of probabilities
 assessment in ‘but-for’ causation 413
 inability to prove on balance of probabilities that harm was result of exposure to agent brought about by breach of duty of care 422
 usual ‘probability’ scenario as to ‘but for’ causation 409–11
 ‘bane’ and ‘antidote’ *see* defamation
- banking services, negligent provision of 200–1
Barrett v Enfield LBC 659
- battery
 actions on the case, distinction from 685
 ancillary actions 688
 assault distinguished from 688–89
 consent defence generally 711–12
 medical treatment 711–12
 ‘true’ consent or ‘true’ refusal of consent 713
 direct applications of force 689–91
 elements of 689–95
 exceptions to tort of 689
 leading cases 692–93
 requisite intent 691–95
 ‘transferred malice’ doctrine 695
 vicarious liability 965
 wilful intent 692
- Bedfordshire* cases, public authority liability 657
- bereavement damages *see* damages
- Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee*
 applications of *Bolam* test 361
Bolam test 359–60
Bolam/Bolitho framework for test of breach of duty of care 359–81
 clarification by *Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* 131, 136–37
 conflicting professional opinions
 anticipation of 366–67
 superiority analysis of 365–66
 validity for *Bolam* test 364–66
 exclusions from *Bolam/Bolitho* framework 376–81
 expanded *Bolam* test 360
 limits of standard of care 297–99
 matters not requiring ‘expert judgment,’ exclusion from *Bolam* test 379–81
 minority professional opinion, validity for *Bolam* test 363–64
 objectively-significant risks 131–34
 ‘peer professional opinion’ test 131–34, 136
 professional guidelines, reliance on as satisfaction of *Bolam* test 367
- questions of fact, exclusion from *Bolam* test 378–79
 and Social Action, Responsibility and Heroism Act 2015 (SARAH Act 2015) 375
 standard of care 292–99
Bolitho v City and Hackney HA
Bolam/Bolitho framework for test of breach of duty of care 359–81
Bolitho causation theorem
 ‘but-for test’ and 443
 explanation of 443–45
 extension to ‘out-of-house’ scenarios 446–47
Bolitho gloss, disregard of *Bolam* 368
Bolitho test
 factors in 370–75
 reasons for 368–70
 exclusions from *Bolam/Bolitho* framework 376–81
 and Social Action, Responsibility and Heroism Act 2015 (SARAH Act 2015) 375
Bolton v Stone factors for breach of duty of care 347–58
Bonnington Castings Ltd v Wardlaw 439–40
 breach of confidence, as ‘non tort’ 7
 breach of contract, negligent misstatement and 169
 breach of duty of care
 analytical approach to 333–34, 347
Bolam/Bolitho framework for test of 359–81
Bolton v Stone quadrant of factors 347–58
 Compensation Act 2006 s 1 and 354–58
 consent to 530–31
 contravention of ‘making it worse’ rule 382–84
 contravention of relevant standards and rules 382
 contravention of specific duties of care 381–82
 date for assessing breach 339–42
 definition of ‘breach’
 exceptions to proof of 394–99
 expanded *Bolam* test 360

- expert organisation's
 recommendation for
 precautionary step 395
- factors for (*Bolton v Stone*) 348–54
- fault *see* fault
- foreseeability, test of 335–39
- and 'gross negligence' 397–99
- ineligible bases for proof 394–99
- 'inevitable accidents'
 arising of 342
 burden of proof 343
 definition of 342–43
- inherent risk, failure to remove
 396–97
- intention to take precautionary
 measures 394–95
- known susceptibilities to injury
 338–39
- 'making it worse' rule
 criticisms of test 383–84
 public authority liability 649–50
 purpose of 382
 scope of application of 382–83
- narrow foreseeability 335–36
- occupiers' liability 609–26
- Occupiers' Liability Act 1957
 609–26
- other potential tests of 381–84
- peer professional opinion, *Bolam/*
Bolitho test 359–81
- post-accident precautionary steps
 395–96
- precautionary steps, testing of
 347–58
- previous occurrence of incident
 336–38
- public authorities and *Bolton v*
Stone quadrant test 354
- quadrant test (*Bolton v Stone*),
 application of 351–53
- relevant standards or rules,
 contravention of 382
- res ipsa loquitur* and 384–94
- skilled visitors to premises,
 occupiers' liability concerning
 619–20
- superiority analysis as to
 conflicting professional
 opinions 365–66
- systemic breach 343–47
- terminology 334–35
- vicarious liability 343–47
- breach of statutory duty
 definition of 2
 framework for analysis 2
- breach of the peace, imminent 731–32
- building regulations, occupiers'
 liability 615–16
- buildings, occupiers' liability 589
- burden of proof
 breach of occupiers' duty of care
 609–26
 causation and 400, 485–86
 damages in tort actions 17
 defences to tort of negligence 514
 evidential difficulty caused by
 defendant 485–86
 general position on 400, 485
 'inevitable accidents' 343
res ipsa loquitur and 391–93
- businesses
 defamation 775–78
 deregistration, public authority
 liability 672
 negligent misstatements as to
 190–91
- 'but-for' test *see* causation
- bystanders, duty of care 101
- Canada
 false imprisonment 701
 inexperienced surgeons, standard
 of care 308
 pure relational economic loss 213
 reasonable foreseeability test 281
res ipsa loquitur 394
- capacity
 assault, requisite capacity 697–98
 to be sued 842–48, 922–23
 child's capacity to consent to
 medical treatment 723
 to sue *see* standing to sue
 to warn or protect 156
- Caparo Industries plc v Dickman*
Anns v Merton LBC disproved by
 assumption of responsibility/
 reliance test, and 45
 components of test for duty of care
 fear-of-the-future victims and 277
 foreseeability test *see* foreseeability
Hedley Byrne test in relation to
 173–76
 incremental test 44, 119–20
 negligent provision of services 196
- proximity element 62–65
- public authority liability 655–74
- public policy, and *see* public policy
- tripartite test for duty of care 44,
 45–46, 109
see also duty of care
- case law as source of law 21
- causa sine qua non* 408
- causation
 analytical approach to 402–3
Bolitho causation theorem
 'but-for test' and 443
 explanation of 443–45
 extension to 'out-of-house'
 scenarios 446–47
- Bonnington Castings Ltd v Wardlaw*
 439–40
- burden of proof
 evidential difficulty caused by
 defendant 485–86
 general position on 400, 485
 no reversal of 485
- 'but-for' test
 application of 408–9
 balance-of-probabilities
 assessment 413
Bolitho causation theorem and
 443
causa sine qua non 408
 conventional test 408
 epidemiological evidence of
 causation 413–14
 exceptions to 416
 exclusive 'certainty' club 411–12
 failure-to-warn cases 447
 inferences, reliance on 414–16
 no fractional damages 412–13
 private nuisance 881–82
 statistical evidence of causation
 414
 usual 'probability' scenario
 409–11
- Chester v Afshar* theorem 447–58
- compensable damage, need for
 proof of 403–8
- contributory negligence and
 521–22
- damage to land or to interest in
 land 880–81
- de minimis* threshold of damage
 403–8
- 'doubling the risk' theorem 436–38

- causation (*cont.*)
 epidemiological evidence of 413–14
 evidence of
 epidemiological 413–14
 statistical 414
 failure-to-warn cases
 ‘but-for’ test 447
 Chester v Afshar exception
 453–58
 general rule of 447–53
Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd 417–24
 false imprisonment 706–10
 ‘hunting’ cases (*Cook v Lewis*)
 438–39
 intervening acts
 acts of nature 467
 in causal chain 458
 characteristics of 458–59
 claimant’s own conduct 465–67
 contexts for 460–67
 defendants’ acts or omissions
 461–63
 effect of 459–60
 subsequent medical treatment
 467–68
 third party’s conduct neither
 negligent nor criminal 464–65
 third party’s criminal or
 negligent acts 463–64
 timeline of 461
 ‘loss of a chance’ claims 408, 470
 ‘material contribution to damage’
 exception
 Bonnington Castings Ltd v Wardlaw 439–40
 de minimis contribution
 requirement 441–42
 exceptional options 442–43
 McGhee/Fairchild principle
 compared 440–42
 proof of breach of duty of care
 441
 same-agent requirement 441
 ‘material contribution to risk’
 exception
 application of 416–17
 apportionment of damages
 430–36
 breach of duty of care precedes
 suffering of precise harm
 caused by agent 421–22
 contributory negligence 419
 defective products 429–30
 ‘doubling the risk’ theorem
 436–38
 failure to take precautions
 against risk of agent causing
 harm
 421
 Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd 417–24
 highest possible level of proof
 is breach of duty of care
 materially increased risk of
 harm 422
 ‘hunting’ cases (*Cook v Lewis*)
 438–39
 inability to prove on balance of
 probabilities that harm was
 result of exposure to agent
 brought about by breach of
 duty of care 422
 McGhee as new principle 428–29
 McGhee v National Coal Board
 417–24
 natural events 420
 scope of *McGhee/Fairchild*
 exceptional theorem 426–30
 ‘single agent,’ meaning of 420
 single agent with both guilty
 and innocent incidents,
 requirement for 417–20
 single or multiple defendants 419
 wider applicability of *Fairchild*
 exception 426–28
 Wilsher v Essex AHA 424–26
 see also causation
McGhee v National Coal Board
 417–24
 occupiers’ liability 627
 Occupiers’ Liability Act 1957 627
 principles of 400–1
 proximity *see* proximity
 and public policy 103
 and public policy factors as to duty
 of care 402–3
 and pure omissions 469–70
 remoteness and causal links 511–12
 and *res ipsa loquitur* 393
Rylands v Fletcher liability 942–44
 statistical evidence of 414
 terminology of 401–2
Wilsher v Essex AHA 424–26
- causes of action
 failure to warn 129–30
 Law Reform (Miscellaneous
 Provisions) Act 1934 28
 negligence as relevant cause
 129–30
 public authorities 639–40
 vested in the deceased 28
 causing loss by unlawful means 2
 champerty 2
 chattels
 consequential damage, under
 Rylands v Fletcher 900
 trespass to 6
Chester v Afshar 447–58
 Australian law compared 457
 causation principle 447, 453–55
 different reasonings 454–55
 limitations of 455–58
 children
 age of, effect on standard of care
 299–302
 behaviour as factor in application
 of suppressed standard of care
 302
 capacity to consent to medical
 treatment 723
 child defendants, law reform as
 to 73
 disabled
 from birth, duty of care owed to
 59–61
 father’s immunity from duty of
 care 123, 124
 pregnant mother’s immunity
 from duty of care 122–24
 reasons for pregnant mother’s
 immunity 123
 wrongful birth claims *see*
 wrongful birth
 wrongful conception after failed
 sterilisation 78–79
 wrongful life claims 124–28
 duty of care
 owed by very young children
 72–73
 parents wrongfully accused of
 sexually or physically abusing
 their children 665
 policy reasons against 663
 policy reasons against duty to
 parents 667

- policy reasons in favour of 660, 662
- policy reasons in favour of duty to pupils 671
- public authority liability 658–59
- social welfare services for neglected and abused children 657
- objective standard of care 301–2
- occupiers' liability concerning 605–8
- parental authority over 730–31
- parents wrongfully accused of sexual or physical abuse 665
- premises dangerous to, occupiers' liability 593
- subjective standard of care 301–2
- suppressed standard of care 299–302
- unborn 58–62
- voluntariness of actions 73
- circumstances, effect on standard of care 311–32
- class of persons, harming of individual member 55
- clinical negligence
 - loss of a chance
 - alternative claims 476
 - economic context contrasted 476
 - Gregg v Scott* 471–74
 - prospect for successful claim 471
 - success of future claims 474–76
 - systemic negligence 344–47
- coastguards, duty of care 86–89
- 'coming to the nuisance' see private nuisance
- common benefit see consent
- 'common enemy' doctrine see private nuisance
- common law
 - actions by dependants 29
 - actions by or against deceased's estate 27
- companies
 - capacity to sue for defamation 768
 - defamation damages 830
- comparative responsibility see responsibility
- comparative risks see risk
- compensation
 - statutory schemes 14–15
 - ways of obtaining 15–17, 164–65
 - see also damages
- Compensation Act 2006 s 1
 - impact of 354
 - judicial consideration of 356–58
 - parliamentary consideration of 356
 - purpose of 354–56
- compensatory damages
 - conventional sum 551–52
 - example of damages recovery 550
- Fatal Accidents Act 1976 (FAA)
 - elements of FAA award 556–57
 - examples of assessments under 563
 - heads of damage under 556–64
 - purpose of FAA award 556
- full compensation as basis of 544
- function of 10
- future costs of treatment 550
- heads of damage
 - available to deceased's estate 552–56
 - available to dependants under Fatal Accidents Act 1976 (FAA) 556–64
 - 'benefit,' meaning of 562
 - benefits accruing to dependant from deceased's death 561–64
 - deceased's divorce prospects 561
 - dependant's remarriage prospects 560
 - elements of FAA award 556–57
 - example under 1934 Act 554–55
 - examples of assessments under FAA 563
- Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1934 552
- non-pecuniary damages for
 - lost services provided by the deceased 559–60
 - non-recoverable damages 555–56
 - pecuniary damages for lost financial support provided by deceased 557–59
 - purpose of FAA award 556
 - recoverable damages 552–55
 - special damages incurred by dependant 560
 - time-frames of pain and suffering 553
- Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1934 552
- level of entitlement 544–45
- loss of congenial employment 547
- loss of consortium/society 547
- loss of earnings
 - future loss 548
 - past loss 548
- loss of expectation of life 547
- monetary compensation, means of obtaining 15–17
- non-pecuniary damages 545–50, 559–60
- pain, suffering, and loss of amenity (PSLA) damages 545
- past and future costs of care (including gratuitous care) 547
- pecuniary damages
 - business losses 558
 - loss of benefits-in-kind 559
 - loss of earnings 557
 - loss of prospects of promotion 558
 - for lost financial support provided by deceased 557–59
 - non-pecuniary damages contrasted 545–50
- private nuisance 899–906
- purpose of 10
- quantum of 739–40
- trespass to the person 739–42
- competing rights, balancing of 11
- concurrent liability (in contract and in tort)
 - contract precludes concurrent duties 20
 - contrast between contract and tort 17
 - exceptions 20–21
 - fact of damage 17
 - general principle 18–21
 - Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd* 18
 - importance 17–18
 - limitation periods 18
 - measure of damages 17
 - precondition for concurrent duties 19–20
 - standard of care 18
- conflict of interest
 - failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 162–63
 - public policy factors as to duty of care 68, 88, 89, 93
- Congenital Disabilities (Civil Liability) Act 1976 58–62

- consent 718
 to breach of duty of care 530–31
 defamation 825
 factors against voluntary consent 531–32
 refusal of 713
Rylands v Fletcher liability 948
 trespass to the person 711–39
 ‘true’ consent 713–18
- consequential damage to chattels 900–1
- conspiracy to injure 2, 965
- Consumer Protection Act 1987
 defective products 8
 products liability 8
 strict liability 8
- contract
 apportionment of risk 12
 cause of action for breach 16
 concurrent liability in contract and in tort 17
 conversion of contractual rights 7
 group contractual arrangements 21
 implied contractual term 604
 inducing breach of 3
 limitation period 18
 negligent misstatement 194–95
- contractors
 employees borrowed from 1010
 employees distinguished from 975–81
 independent contractor/non-delegable duty defence 896
 negligent selection of 1004–6
 occupiers’ liability to 621–26
- contributory negligence
 alternative allegations 516
 Australian law compared 517
 causation and 521–22
 comparative responsibility 522–24
 damages, reduction of 524
 death and 32
 defence of 515–26
 doctor and patient relationship, application to 524–26
 elements of 516, 519–24
 fault element 519–21
 is a complete defence 517–18
 ‘last opportunity’ rule 518
 Law Reform (Contributory Negligence) Act 1945 515
 meaning of 515
 not a complete defence 516
- occupiers’ liability 634–35
 as partial or total defence 516–18
 personal culpability as defence 8
 practical matters relating to 515
 private nuisance 898–99
 and reasonable foreseeability 519
 reduction of recoverable damages 524
Rylands v Fletcher liability 949
 transferred negligence 518–19
 trespass to the person 734–37
- conversion
 of contractual rights 7
 defined 3
Cook v Lewis (‘hunting’ cases) 438–39
 corrective justice 67, 79, 80, 90, 108
- costs
 general rule of costs-shifting 22–23
 ‘no-way’ rule 23
 ‘one-way’ rule 23
 recoverability, limits on 23
 recoverable in ‘wrongful conception’ claims 75
 reform of cost-shifting rule 23–24
 rules 22
- countryside *see* rural areas
- court proceedings *see* litigation
- creditworthiness, negligent misstatement as to 180–82
- crime and criminal penalties, torts and 9
- crime prevention, ‘prevention of crime, disorder, or ill-discipline,’ defence of 728–32
- Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme 13
- culpability, as defence 8
- damage
 further damage to claimant caused by supervening act 478–82
 non-tortious reasons for supervening acts would have led to same damage 483–84
 not too remote 494
 private nuisance *see* private nuisance
 reasonable foreseeability 492
 remoteness and categories of 489–99
 remoteness of 17
 damage to property
 duty of care *see* duty of care
- foreseeability *see* foreseeability
 psychiatric harm and 218
 and secondary victims of psychiatric harm 238–39
see also environmental pollution
- damages
 aggravated damages 10, 567–69
 apportionment
Barker v Corus Ltd, principle in 431–33
 Compensation Act 2006, s 3 434–35
McGhee/Fairchild exceptional theorem of causation 430–31
 types of liability 430
 where no insured employer 435–36
- bereavement damages 565–66
- compensatory damages *see* compensatory damages
- concurrent liability in contract and in tort and 17
- contributory negligence, reduction of damages 524
- de minimis* threshold of contrasting reasoning in *Pleural Plaques* litigation 405–6
 general principle of 403–6
- defamation *see* defamation
- Fatal Accidents Act 1976 32
- Human Rights Act 1998 913–14
- Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1934 28
- in lieu of injunction 909–11
- no fractional damages in ‘but-for’ causation 412–13
- nominal damages 10, 576–77
- pain, suffering, and loss of amenity (PSLA) damages 545
- pecuniary damages *see* compensatory damages
- proof of, need for across torts 8
- punitive *see* exemplary damages
- reduction in contributory negligence cases 524
- remoteness of, in psychiatric harm claims 221–22
- restitutionary damages 10, 577–78
- user damages 10
- wrongful birth 84–85
see also compensation
- danger
 activity dangers 593

- Rylands v Fletcher* liability 933–34
 static dangers 593
 unjustifiable imposition of 103
 dangerous persons, failure to control,
 supervise or detain *see* third
 parties
 dangerous sports *see* sport
 date *see* time
de minimis principle
 psychiatric harm and 222
 and threshold of damage 222
 death
 actions in tort 26
 bereavement damages 565–66
 caused by children's acts or
 omissions 72–73
 common law actions
 by or against deceased's estate 27
 by dependants 29
 compensatory damages 544–66
 contributory negligence 32
 damages under Fatal Accidents Act
 1976 (FAA) 32, 556–64
 dead body, wrongful interference
 with 7
 deceased's estate, actions by or
 against 26–28
 dependant as appropriate claimant
 30–31
 dependants' actions 28–32
 exceptions in tort actions 26
 Fatal Accidents Act 1976 (FAA)
 actions under 26
 compensatory damages 556–64
 Law Reform (Miscellaneous
 Provisions) Act 1934, actions
 under 26
 loss of dependency, proof of 31
 reasonable expectation test, and 31
 survival actions 26
 wrongful death actions 26
 deceit *see* fraudulent
 misrepresentation
 declarations of falsity 831
 defamation
 absolute privilege 824–25
 acquiescence defence 825
 aggravated damages 830–31
 analytical approach to 749–50
 ancillary actions 752
 associations, capacity to sue 768
 'bane and antidote' 780
 business defamation 775–78
 capacity to sue 766–69
 companies, capacity to sue 768
 consent defence 825
 damages
 aggravated damages 830–31
 companies 830
 'egg-shell skull' rule in relation
 to 829
 excessive jury awards 830
 exemplary damages 830–31
 mitigatory factors 829
 personal injury awards compared
 with 830
 quantum of 827–29
 declarations of falsity 831
 defamatory imputation 769–82
*Derbyshire CC v Times Newspapers
 Ltd* 766
 difficulties with 750–52
 establishment of 752–59
 exemplary damages 830–31
 fair comment defence 795–802
 false innuendo 771
 fictional characters, use of 785–86
 function of 749
 governmental authorities, capacity
 to sue 766–68
 group defamation 787
 honest opinion defence 795–802
 identification as victim of
 fictional characters, use of
 785–86
 general principles of 783
 group defamation 787
 mistaken description or
 photographs 786–87
 named in one place and not in
 another 784–85
 problem of 783
 problematical scenarios 783
 reference innuendo 783
 importance 755–59
 injunctive relief 831
 innocent dissemination 807–10
 innuendo 771
 intent
 of publisher 780–82
 relevance of 782
 internet publications 791–95
 introduction to 749
Jameel v Dow Jones & Co Inc
 761–64
 jurisdiction 759–61
 justiciability 749
 justification, defence of 802–6
 law reform 767
 legal innuendo 771–72
 legitimate public interest 823–24
 libel *see* libel
 literal meaning of words 770–71
 meaning of words complained of,
 ascertainment of 769–72
 mistaken description or
 photographs 786–87
 natural and probable consequences
 789
 newspaper corrections, order for
 832
 offer of amends 826–27
 partnerships, capacity to sue 768
 peer-reviewed statements in
 scientific or academic journals
 806–7
 personal defamation 772–75
 photographs 786–87
 police official as publishee 790–91
 popular innuendo 771
 proof of 'real and substantial tort'
 761–66
 public authorities, capacity to sue
 766–68
 public interest privilege (*Reynolds*
 defence) 810–17
 publication element
 defamatory imputation
 772
 general principles of 788
 internet search engine providers
 and web hosts 793–95
 natural and probable
 consequences 789
 publishee, status as 790–91
 'republication damage' 789–90
 'single publication' rule 788–89
 time of publication 788–90
 websites 791–93
 publishee, status as 790–91
 publisher's intent 780–82
 qualified privilege 818
 'reasonable reader/listener'
 standard 778–80
 reference innuendo 783
 remedies 827–32
 reportage defence 822–24
 'republication damage' 789–90
 search engines 793–95

- defamation (*cont.*)
 secondary publishers, innocent dissemination 808–10
 ‘serious harm’ requirement (Defamation Act 2013) 764
 ‘single publication’ rule 788–89
 slander *see* slander
 solicitor as publishee 790–91
 statutory reforms for 751
 subject matter 761
 test of defamatory imputation 772–78
 trade unions, capacity to sue 769
 true innuendo 771–72
 truth as defence in 802–6
 types of torts 749
 unincorporated associations, capacity to sue 769
 victim, identification as 783–87
 web hosting 793–95
 websites 791–93, 810
- defective premises
 building standards 615–16
 definition of 591
 occupiers’ liability 589–92
- defective products, ‘material contribution to risk’ exception and 429–30
- defences
 absolute privilege 824–25
 acquiescence 825
 act of God *see* act of God
 act of *vis major* 945
 acts of strangers 635, 945–47
 burden of proof 514
 ‘common enemy’ doctrine 897
 consent *see* consent
 contributory negligence *see* contributory negligence
 fair comment *see* honest opinion
 honest opinion *see* honest opinion
 independent contractor/non-delegable duty defence 896
 innocent dissemination *see* innocent dissemination
 introduction to 514
 necessity *see* necessity
 occupiers’ liability 634–36
 offer of amends 826–27
 peer-reviewed statements, privilege for 806–7
 prescription, right of 894–95
 public interest privilege *see* public interest
- qualified privilege 818
 reportage defence 822–24
Rylands v Fletcher liability 944–49
 statutory authorisation 889–93
 therapeutic privilege *see* privilege to tort of negligence 514
 truth 802–6
volenti see volenti
Derbyshire CC v Times Newspapers Ltd 766
- deregistration of businesses, public authority liability 672
- detention, powers of 728
- deterrence function of tort law 10–11
- detinue 7
- detrimental reliance on negligent misstatements 194
- disability
 awareness of 304–5
 effect on standard of care 302–5
 non-awareness of 303–4
- disabled children *see* children
- diseases, statutory compensation schemes 13
- distributive justice
 disabled children born after failed sterilisations 79
 duty of care owed to rescuers 108
 failed sterilisations of disabled mothers 81
 public policy, and 67, 79
 young children’s duty of care 73
- doctors
 ‘Bad Samaritan’ liability 104
 conflicting professional opinions, validity for *Bolam* test 364–66
 contravention of specific duty of care 381
 contributory negligence 524–26
 duty of care 50, 52
 foreseeability test, and 52
 minority professional opinion, validity for *Bolam* test 363–64
 ‘peer professional opinion’ test (*Bolam/Bolitho* framework) 359–81
 reliance on professional guidelines, *Bolam* test and 367
 superiority analysis as to conflicting opinions 365–66
 therapeutic privilege *see* privilege
 wrongful conception claims against 74–82
- domestic case law as source of law 21
- domestic legislation as source of law 21–22
Donoghue v Stevenson 36
 ‘doubling the risk’ theorem *see* causation
- driving
 contravention of specific duty of care 381
 pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care when refusing 123, 124
- drug abuse, pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care 122
- dual vicarious liability *see* vicarious liability
- duty of care
Anns v Merton LBC test for 40
 assumption of responsibility 44, 46, 111–19
 breach of *see* breach of duty of care
 breach of non-delegable 951–52
Caparo Industries plc v Dickman 45–46, 65–110, 655–74
 categorisation approach
 children *see* children
 ‘common duty of care,’ occupiers’ liability 603
 common duty of care, occupiers’ liability 596–97, 605
 Congenital Disabilities (Civil Liability) Act 1976 59–61
 duty to take positive steps 604
 elevated primary victims of psychiatric harm 275–77
 exceptions 50–51
 existence of 48–51
 fairness and 65–70
 foreseeability of harm 52
 foreseeability test, and 53–57
 historical overview 36–43
 immunities 70–71
 incremental test 119–20
 incremental test (*Caparo Industries plc v Dickman*) 43, 44
 insurance and *see* insurance
 justice and 65–70
 lack of 35
 legal framework 35–36
 ‘neighbour principle’ (*Donoghue v Stevenson*)
 no destruction of duty (‘very thing’ principle) 532–33
 non-delegable 951–52, 1006–10
 novel cases

- definition of 47–48
 - tests for 44
 - parents, duty owed to, or by see parents
 - primary victims of psychiatric harm 244
 - principled approach in *Home Office v Dorset Yacht Co.*
 - proximity see proximity
 - of public authorities 649–75
 - public policy, and see public policy
 - pure economic loss see economic loss
 - pure omissions 142
 - pure psychiatric injury see psychiatric harm
 - reasonableness and 65–70
 - relationships traditionally giving rise to 49–50
 - reliance see reliance
 - residuary claimants of psychiatric harm 281–82
 - Rylands v Fletcher* liability 951–52
 - ‘scope of duty’ enquiry
 - Australian law compared 511
 - as control mechanism 503–6
 - failure-to-warn scenarios 510–11
 - South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd (SAAMCO)* 505, 507–10
 - see also remoteness
 - to secondary victims of psychiatric harm 237–38
 - statutory preclusions 122–28
 - strike-out applications and 25
 - tests of 43–51
 - third parties, failure to control, supervise or detain 148–66
 - towards trespassers 629–32
 - towards visitors 603–4
 - see also breach of duty of care
 - duty to refer, ‘locality rule’ and 296
 - duty to rescue see ‘Bad Samaritan’ liability
- E (A Minor) v Dorset CC* see *Bedfordshire cases*
- East Berkshire case* see *JD v East Berkshire Community Health NHS Trust*
- 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 *Wednesbury* test 643–46
- ECHR see European Convention on Human Rights
- economic loss
- actions for 176
 - claims for pure economic loss 167
 - definition of pure economic loss 167–68
 - duty to exercise reasonable care 168
 - Egg-Shell Skull Rule and 501, 502–3
 - foreseeability 172–73
 - loss of a chance
 - loss of economic opportunity 477–78
 - loss of legal rights 477
 - medical negligence claims contrasted 476
 - negligent misstatement see negligent misstatement
 - negligent provision of services see negligent provision of services
 - personal injury prioritised 69, 110
 - proprietors of deregistered business, public authority liability 672
 - pure relational economic loss
 - Australian law compared 213–14
 - Canadian law compared 213
 - exclusionary rule 206–7, 210
 - exclusionary rule, exceptions to 212
 - public policy factors as to duty of care 207–12
 - Spartan Steel and Alloys Ltd v Martin & Co (Contractors) Ltd* 207–11
 - ‘transferred loss’ principle, rejection of 211–12
 - ‘transferred loss’ principle, rejection of 211–12
 - educational services
 - duty of care 49, 64, 669
 - failure to control, supervise or detain 151–52
 - proximity requirement for duty of care 64
 - schools, duty of care 49
 - vicarious liability 967
 - egg-shell skull
 - in defamation damages 829
 - economic damage, applicability to 501, 502–3
 - Egg-Shell Skull Rule 500–3
 - and ‘normal fortitude’ rule 499–500
 - reasonable foreseeability 499
 - remoteness of damage 499–503
 - elevated primary victims of psychiatric harm see psychiatric harm
 - emergencies, necessity and 541
 - emergency services
 - ‘agony of the moment’ scenarios 314–15
 - ambulance service 89–90
 - coastguards 86–89
 - conflict of duties 88, 89
 - danger created or worsened by 88–89
 - duty of care owed by 86–89
 - failure to turn up 86–87
 - fire services 86–89
 - ineffectual service 87–88
 - police see police forces
 - public authority liability 651
 - public policy factors as to duty of care 88
 - employees
 - ‘akin to employee’ status 975–81
 - borrowed from contractor 1010
 - independent contractor distinguished from 975–81
 - loaned employees 981–86
 - occupiers’ duty of care to visiting 582–83
 - protection from financial ruination 972
 - stressed-at-work claims see psychiatric harm
 - vicarious liability 968–70
 - employers
 - duty of care 49, 50, 53
 - foreseeability test, and 53
 - vicarious liability see vicarious liability
 - encroachment, *Rylands v Fletcher* liability 933–34
 - English law, torts in 1
 - environmental pollution, objective standard as to interference with use and enjoyment of land 850
 - epidemics, evidence of causation 413–14
 - epidemiological evidence see causation

- equity, causes of action in 16
- escape
- accidental escapes 932
 - of a dangerous thing 923–32
 - of fire
 - scenario 928–29
 - statutory regime 955–59
 - foreseeability of 930–32
 - intentional escapes 932
 - knowledge of 930
 - mischief or danger test 929–30
 - necessity of escape 925–29
 - ‘no encroachment’ scenarios 926–28
 - ‘no escape’ scenarios 925–26
 - ‘things’ which have escaped 923–25
see also Rylands v Fletcher liability
 - estoppel by acquiescence 897
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
- exemplary damages not available for infringements of 571
 - failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 165–66
 - immunities from duty of care, Art 6(1) and 70–71
 - necessity defence, trespass to the person 727–28
 - police forces, duty of care 101
 - public authority liability
 - Article 6 and 676–78
 - harmonisation of common law 679–81
 - strike-out procedure 678–79
 - taking actions to ECtHR 675–76
 - timeline of important events 677–78
- events and actions
- intervening acts
 - acts of nature 467
 - in causal chain 458
 - characteristics of 458–59
 - claimant’s own conduct 465–67
 - contexts for 460–67
 - defendants’ acts or omissions 461–63
 - effect of 459–60
 - subsequent medical treatment 467–68
 - supervening acts contrasted with 478
 - third party’s conduct neither negligent nor criminal 464–65
 - third party’s criminal or negligent acts 463–64
 - timeline of 461
 - supervening acts
 - Baker v Willoughby* and successive tortfeasors
 - further damage to claimant 478–82
 - intervening acts contrasted with 478
 - Jobling v Associated Dairies Ltd* 483–84
 - Judicial Reaction to *Baker v Willoughby* 482
 - non-tortious reasons for acts would have led to same damage 483–84
 - timeline of 481, 484
 - evidence, *res ipsa loquitur* and disputed expert evidence 387
 - exclusion, exclusionary rule as to private nuisance 884–86
 - exclusion by agreement, occupiers’ liability 636
 - exemplary damages
 - Australian law compared 574
 - defamation 830–31
 - deterrent function 10
 - ECHR infringements, no damages for 571
 - in English Law 569–71
 - gross negligence 572
 - law reform 571
 - negligent wrongdoing, types of 572–73
 - other jurisdictions compared 572–73
 - public authorities, claims against 571
 - public policy objections 574–76
 - punitive nature of 569
 - quantification of awards 573–74
 - quantum of 745
 - reckless conduct 573
 - Rookes v Barnard* 569
 - trespass to the person 744–46
 - triggering of 572–73
 - wilful wrongdoing 573
 - expenditure, unjustifiable imposition of 103
 - expert evidence, *res ipsa loquitur* and disputed evidence 387
 - experts
 - expert organisation’s recommendation for precautionary step 395
 - matters not requiring ‘expert judgment,’ exclusion from *Bolam* test 379–81
 - facts
 - imputation of 803
 - public interest 817
 - questions of fact, exclusion from *Bolam* test 378–79
 - res ipsa loquitur* and incontrovertible facts 387–88
 - statement of fact *see* honest opinion
 - failed sterilisations *see* wrongful conception
 - failure to control, supervise or detain *see* third parties
 - failure to warn
 - allegations, categories of 128–29
 - Australian law compared 457
 - cause of action 129–30
 - Chester v Afshar* 453–58
 - excluded claims 129
 - inherent risks
 - categories of 130
 - definition of 128
 - non-disclosure of 129–30
 - negligence as relevant cause of action 129–30
 - 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 131–34
 - warnings in medical booklets/literature 138–39
 - remoteness and 510–11
 - ‘scope of duty’ enquiry and 510–11
 - 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
- timing of warning 142
- fair comment *see* honest opinion
- Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd* 417–24, 426–30, 440–42
- fairness, public policy as to duty of care 65–70
- false imprisonment
 - analytical approach to 699
 - arising of claims 698
 - Australian law compared 701
 - Canadian law compared 701
 - causation 706–10
 - consent defence 718
 - constraint on freedom of movement 700–5
 - definition of 699
 - elements of 700–5
 - intent 705–6
 - other jurisdictions compared 701–2
- falsity, declarations of 831
- families
 - compensatory damages for death *see* compensatory damages
 - dependants' claims 28–32
 - special needs of patient's family, awareness of 141
 - see also* children; parents
- Fatal Accidents Act 1976 (FAA)
 - bereavement damages 565
 - compensatory damages 556–64
 - damages 32
 - dependants' claims under 28–32
 - elements of FAA award 556–57
 - examples of assessments under 563
 - excluded claims 31–32
 - heads of damage under 556–64
 - purpose of 29
 - purpose of FAA award 556
 - wrongful death actions 26
- fathers *see* children
- fault
 - in contributory negligence
 - fault element 519
 - meaning of 'fault' 519
 - proof of breach of duty of care 520–21
 - reasonable foreseeability 519
 - trespass to the person 734–37
 - meaning of 519
 - necessity and no prior fault 542
 - strict liability, and 8
- fear-of-the-future claimants
 - of psychiatric harm *see* psychiatric harm
- fictional characters in defamation 785–86
- fire
 - escape of
 - scenario 928–29
 - standard of care 328
 - statutory regime 955–59
 - Fires Prevention (Metropolis) Act 1774
 - defence to liability 955
 - protection lost through negligence 956–58
 - reason for Act 956
 - Rylands v Fletcher* in relation 958–59
 - fire services
 - 'agony of the moment' scenarios 315
 - duty of care 86–89
 - public authority liability 651
 - floods, standard of care as to escape of floodwaters 329
- force
 - infliction of 696–97
 - irresistible force *see* act of *vis major*
- foreseeability
 - Anns v Merton LBC*
 - breach of duty of care 335–39
 - Caparo* test, and 56–57
 - duty of care, and 53–57
 - elevated primary victims of psychiatric harm 276
 - fault and 519
 - and fear-of-the-future claimants 277–78
 - foreseeable class of claimants 55
 - general principles of 51–57
 - general type of harm 53–55
 - harm, reasonable foreseeability of 154–55
 - harming of individual member of class of persons 55
 - known susceptibilities to injury 338–39
 - narrower test of 335–36
 - as objective test 56
 - previous occurrence of incident 336–38
 - proximity equated with pure economic loss 172–73
 - reasonable foreseeability
 - concept of 53, 490–97
 - damage from private nuisance 882–84
 - damage not too remote 494
 - egg-shell skull claims 499
 - exception to requirement of 497–99
 - fault and 519
 - focus of test 490
 - general principles of 491–94
 - occupiers' liability, proof of breach 610–11
 - public authority duty of care 656–57
 - test of foreseeability at other stages 490–91
 - remoteness, and 52
 - remoteness and 490–97
 - residuary claimants of psychiatric harm 281
 - secondary victims of psychiatric harm 254–55
 - susceptibility to injury 57–58
 - tests of 51–53
 - unborn claimants, harm to 58–62
- fraudulent misrepresentation
 - negligent misstatement, and 170
 - tort of 3
 - vicarious liability 965
- 'gap-filler' role of torts 12
- garden landscaping, negligent provision of services 199–200
- general practitioners, 'agony of the moment' scenarios 315

- 'Good Samaritan' liability
 - 'agony of the moment' scenarios 313
 - public policy factors as to duty of care 108–9
- goods, wrongful interference with 7
- government and tort, human rights issues 22
- Grieves v FT Everard & Sons Ltd* see *Pleural Plaques* litigation
- gross negligence see negligence
- group contractual arrangements 21
- group defamation see defamation
- harassment
 - definition of 3
 - statutory tort of 9
- harm
 - breach of duty of care precedes suffering of precise harm caused by agent 421–22
 - employers' liability 49
 - failure to take precautions against risk of agent causing harm 421
 - foreseeability 53–55
 - gravity of, proximity in relation to 65
 - highest possible level of proof
 - is breach of duty of care materially increased risk of harm 422
 - inability to prove on balance of probabilities that harm was result of exposure to agent brought about by breach of duty of care 422
 - to individual member of class of persons 55
 - psychiatric see psychiatric harm see also injury
- health authorities
 - failure to control, supervise or detain 152
 - public authority liability 652
 - standard of care where limited availability of resources 332
 - vicarious liability 967
- healthcare practitioners
 - 'diagnosis with a focus' scenarios as to standard of care 316
 - duty of care 50, 52
 - foreseeability test, and 52
- general practitioners, 'agony of the moment' scenarios 315
- graduated specialisms 292–96
- Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd*
 - assumption of responsibility 44, 111
 - Caparo* test, distinguishable from 173–76
 - 'extended principle' 195
 - negligent misstatement 169–95
 - negligent provision of services 195–206
 - proof of reliance 116
 - see also Negligent misstatement
- Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd*, concurrent liability in contract and in tort 18
- highways see road
- Hill v CC of West Yorkshire* 91–94, 100–1
- Home Office v Dorset Yacht Co.*, principled approach to duty of care
- homelessness, public authority liability as to accommodation 654
- honest opinion
 - absence of malice 801–2
 - based on existing fact, or privileged statement 799–801
 - basis of opinion 798
 - statement of opinion; not of fact 796–98
- Hong Kong, shock requirement for psychiatric harm 271
- hospitals see medical services
- houses, negligent misstatements as to valuation and structural soundness of 182–84
- housing
 - landlords' failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 153–54
 - public authority liability as to accommodation for homeless persons 654
- human rights see European Convention on Human Rights; Human Rights Act 1998
 - concurrent actions with tort 22
 - damages under 913–14
 - immunities from duty of care 70–71
- proof of violation 912–13
- 'public authority,' definition of 22
- as source of law 22
- 'hunting' cases see causation; *Cook v Lewis*
- immediate aftermath doctrine see psychiatric harm
- immigration, public authority duty of care 671
- immunities
 - police forces 90
 - pregnant mothers 122–24
 - public policy grounds 70–71
 - see also absolute privilege
- imputations (defamatory) see defamation
- in personam* protection of rights under tort law 15
- incremental test (*Caparo Industries plc v Dickman*) 119–20
 - duty of care, and 43, 44
 - failure to control, supervise or detain third parties 165
 - negligent misstatement and 173
 - negligent provision of services 196
- indeterminate liability
 - and 'Bad Samaritan' liability 103
 - public policy factors as to duty of care 68
 - see also third parties
- individual liberty, public policy and see public policy
- inducing (procuring) breach of contract 3
- 'inevitable accidents' see accidents
- inferences, reliance on 414–16
- injunctions
 - damages in lieu of 909–11
 - defamation 831
 - private nuisance 906–9
 - as remedy 543, 831
- injurious falsehood 4
- injury
 - conspiracy to injure 965
 - egg-shell skull claims 501
 - gravity of injury if risk manifests 135–36
 - known susceptibilities to 338–39
 - and 'normal fortitude' rule 499–500
 - 'occurrence' of, events leading to 58
 - prospect of 537

1023 Index

- reasonable foreseeability 491–94
 susceptibility to 57–58
 see also harm
- innocent dissemination
 common law defence 807–8
 operators of websites 810
 reliance on 807
 statutory defence for secondary
 publishers 808–10
- innuendos
 false (popular) 771
 reference innuendo 783
 true (legal) 771–72
 see also defamation
- insurance
 (non)availability 71–72
 insurability 68, 110
 negligent provision of underwriting
 services 197
- intention
 battery 691–95
 defamation
 publisher's intent 780–82
 relevance of intent 782
 false imprisonment 705–6
- intentional conduct, non-intentional
 conduct, and 8
- intentional harm 573
- intentional infliction of mental
 distress or physical harm 4
- intentional interference with
 another's person see battery;
 assault; false imprisonment;
 interference
- inter vivos* transactions see wills
- interference
 with another's contractual relations
 3
 dead body 7
 goods 7
 physical interference 851
 see also wrongful conception
- interference, loss by unlawful means
 and 3
- internet
 defamation 791–95
 see also web hosting; websites
- intervening acts see causation
- intimidation 2
- Ipp Committee 226, 252, 257, 266
- Ireland
 child defendants, law reform as
 to 73
- 'easy rescue' principle 103–4
 necessity and rescuers 542
 standard of care 297
 suppressed standard of care for
 children 301
 vicarious liability 992–93
- irresistible force see act of *vis major*
- Jameel v Dow Jones & Co Inc* 761
- JD v East Berkshire Community
 Health NHS Trust* 661, 666
- Jobling v Associated Dairies Ltd*
 483–84
- Johnston v NEI Intl Combustion Ltd*
 see *Pleural Plaques* litigation
- jurisdiction, defamation 759–61
- justice
 administration of, public policy
 and 81
 corrective 67
 distributive 67, 73
 public policy as to duty of care
 65–70, 81
- justification defence see truth
- Keegan v CC of Merseyside* and
 concurrent actions in tort
 16
- knowledge
 of propensities of third parties
 156–57
 of at-risk person's identity 158
- land
 damage to land or to interest in
 land, private nuisance 880–81
 escape of floodwaters onto 329
 interference with use and
 enjoyment see private nuisance
 loss of support for 329
 natural users of 936–37
 naturally occurring features,
 occupiers' liability 591, 592
 non-natural users of
 dramatic change of use 934–35
 modern articulation and
 application of test 935–42
 occupiers' liability 589
 public authority liability as to
 protection of 653
 trespass to 6
 see also *Rylands v Fletcher* liability
- landlords
 failure to control, supervise or
 detain third parties 153–54
 occupiers' liability 587–88
 landowners, adjacent occupiers'
 liability for damage to 327–29
- landscaping see garden landscaping
- 'last opportunity' rule see
 contributory negligence
- law reform
 aggravated damages 569
 defamation 767
 direct perception of accident,
 requirement for 266
 distinction between libel and
 slander 753
 exemplary damages 571
 immediate aftermath doctrine
 261
 inexperienced surgeons, standard
 of care 308
 necessity defence, trespass to the
 person 725
 'normal fortitude' rule 251, 267,
 287
 reasonable foreseeability test 246
 relational proximity 257–61
Rylands v Fletcher liability 954–55
 shock requirement for psychiatric
 harm 253, 273
 suppressed standard of care for
 children 301
 threshold damage as to psychiatric
 injury 226
 vicarious liability 969–70
- Law Reform (Contributory
 Negligence) Act 1945 515
- Law Reform (Miscellaneous
 Provisions) Act 1934
 actions under 26
 compensatory damages 552
- lawful visitors see occupiers' liability;
 visitors (lawful)
- legal policy see public policy
- legal rights, loss-of-a-chance claims
 477
- legal services, negligent provision of
 198–99
- legislation as source of law 21–22
- liability
 fault or strict liability, whether 8
 'indeterminate liability problem'
 68
 'liability principle' 96–97

- libel
 as crime or tort 759
 definition of 753
 establishment of 752–59
 law reform 753
 slander distinguished from 753
see also defamation
- liberty and public policy *see* public policy
- licences, implied licence to enter 602–3
- limitation periods
 concurrent liability in contract and in tort 18
 variation across torts 9
- Lister v Hesley Hall Ltd* 991–93
- Lister v Romford Ice* 969–70
- litigation
 diversion of police resources in duty of care litigation 92
 ‘floodgates’ concerns 67, 79
 matter for Parliament rather than courts 69, 93
 ‘satellite litigation’ problem 70
- local authorities *see* public authorities
- localities (rural) *see* rural areas
- ‘locality rule’ and duty to refer 296
- loss
 compensatory damages for *see* compensatory damages
 of legal rights 477
 loss distribution rationale for vicarious liability 972
- loss of a chance
 causation and 408, 470
 economic context
 loss of economic opportunity 477–78
 loss of legal rights 477
 medical negligence claims contrasted 476
 meaning of 470–71
 medical negligence context
 alternative claims 476
 economic context contrasted 476
Gregg v Scott 471–74
 prospect for successful claim 471
 success of future claims 474–76
- M (A Minor) v Newham LBC* *see* *Bedfordshire cases*
- maintenance, tort of 4
- ‘making it worse’ rule *see* breach of duty of care
- Malaysia, *res ipsa loquitur* 394
- malice
 and honest opinion 801–2
see also absence of malice
- malicious falsehood, definition of 4
- malicious procurement of a search warrant 5
- malicious prosecution 5
- McGhee v National Coal Board* 417–24, 426–30, 440–42
- media *see* newspapers; websites
- medical practitioners *see* doctors; general practitioners
- medical services
 A&E receptionists, contravention of specific duty of care 382
 duty of care 50, 52
 foreseeability test, and 52
 graduated specialisms 292–96
 hospitals and ‘Bad Samaritan’ liability 104–5
 negligent provision of services 201–3
 therapeutic privilege *see* privilege
- medical treatment
 (in)experience in (non-)professional activities, effect on standard of care 305–11
 children’s capacity to consent 723
 consent defence to battery 711–12
 contributory negligence 524–26
 ‘diagnosis with a focus’ scenarios as to standard of care 316
 duty to refer, ‘locality rule’ and 296
 essential or elective medical procedures 137–38
 foregoing of 537
 general practitioners, ‘agony of the moment’ scenarios 315
 inexperienced surgeons, standard of care 308
 intervening acts in subsequent treatment 467–68
 necessity defence, trespass to the person 719–25
 physician’s experience of risk 138
 pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care when refusing 123
 ‘reasonable patient’ test 131–34, 139–40
- risk warnings in medical booklets/literature 138–39
 subjectively significant risks, disclosure of 139
 systemic negligence 344–47
 therapeutic privilege *see* privilege
 validly held decision to withhold information about material risk of treatment 538–39
- mental injury *see* psychiatric harm
- migration *see* immigration
- mischief rule, *Rylands v Fletcher* liability 933–34
- misfeasance in public office 5, 965
- misrepresentation and negligent misstatement 169
- misuse of drugs, pregnant mother’s immunity from duty of care 122
- misuse of private information 5
- mitigation, duty of *see* damages
- monetary compensation, means of obtaining 15–17
- mosquitoes, standard of care as to escape of 329
- mothers *see* children
- Motor Insurers’ Bureau, statutory compensation schemes 13
- movable structures, occupiers’ liability 589
- natural user of land *see* land; *Rylands v Fletcher* liability
- necessity
 elements of 541–42
 emergency, existence of 541
 no prior fault 542
 rescuers and 542
 scope of 540–41
 uncertainties as to 540
- negligence
 causation, proof of *see* causation
 compensable damage, need for proof of 403–8
 and conflicting rights 11
 contributory negligence *see* contributory negligence
 defences to *see* defences
 duty of care *see* duty of care
 foreseeability *see* foreseeability
 gross negligence
 and breach of duty of care 397–99
 exceptions to 398–99

- exemplary damages 572
- general rule of 398
- limitation of liability 397
- meaning of 397–98
- public authorities *see* public authorities
- reasonableness standard 288–89
- recognition of tort of in *Donoghue v Stevenson* 36
- requirements for tort of 35
- selection of contractor 1004–6
- specific regimes *see* occupiers' liability; public authorities
- systemic negligence for medical wrongdoing 344–47
- vicarious liability 997
- wilful negligence, exemplary damages 573
- negligent misstatement
 - actions for pure economic loss 176
 - advice on creditworthiness, provision of 180–82
 - advice on valuation and structural soundness of a house, provision of 182–84
 - analytical approach for 171–72
 - ancillary causes of action 169–70
 - audited statements, provision of 184–87
 - bi-partite relationships 177–79
 - breach of contract, and 169
 - businesses, inaccurate statements or certification as to 190–91
 - Caparo* test 173
 - contractual relationship, and 194–95
 - detrimental reliance 194
 - factors relevant to imposition of duty of care 191–93
 - fraudulent misrepresentation, and 170
 - Hedley Byrne and Co Ltd v Heller and Partners Ltd*, principle in 169, 170–71
 - Hedley Byrne* test in relation to other tests 173
 - incremental test 173
 - matters that do not preclude duty of care 193–95
 - meaning of 169
 - misrepresentation and 169
 - order of tests for, 173II f
 - pure economic loss, and 169–95
 - reasonable foreseeability of economic loss 172–73
 - references, provision of erroneous 188–90
 - residuary claimants of psychiatric harm 279
 - 'skill,' meaning of 169
 - tri-partite relationships 179–87
 - victim scenario 187–93
- negligent provision of services
 - 'extended *Hedley Byrne* principle' 195
 - introduction to 195–96
 - leading cases 197–203
 - scenarios 196–206
 - tests for 196
 - tri-partite relationship 197
 - White v Jones* principle 203–6
- 'neighbour principle' (*Donoghue v Stevenson*) as to duty of care
- nervous shock claims *see* psychiatric harm; shock
- Nettleship v Weston* 305
- 'neutral reporting' *see* reportage
- New Zealand
 - res ipsa loquitur* 394
 - statutory compensation schemes 14–15
- newspapers, orders for corrections 832
- nominal damages
 - meaning of 10
 - non-availability for negligence 576
 - 'traditional sum' of 576
- non-intentional conduct, intentional conduct and 8
- non-natural user of land *see* land; *Rylands v Fletcher* liability
- non-pecuniary damages *see* compensatory damages
- 'non-torts' 7
- 'normal fortitude' rule
 - contrasts with other areas 251–52
 - and egg-shell skull claims 499–500
 - elevated primary victims of psychiatric harm 276–77
 - and fear-of-the-future claimants 277–78
 - inapplicability of 250–52
 - law reform 251–52, 287
 - origin in *Page v Smith* 250–51
 - stressed-at-work claims 286–87
- novel cases
 - definition of 47–48
 - tests for 44
- nuisance *see* private nuisance
- obiter dictum* principle 21
- objectively significant risks *see* risk
- occupational stress
 - analytical approach to 219
 - definition of scenarios 243
- 'occupier,' definition of 585
- occupiers' liability 591, 592
 - activity dangers
 - application of OLA 1957 and OLA 1984 to 594–95
 - definition of 593
 - acts of strangers, as defence 635
 - allurement, doctrine of 601–2
 - analytical approach to 584
 - breach of duty of care
 - building standards 615–16
 - non-obvious risks 618
 - obvious risks 616–19
 - occupier's independent contractors 621–26
 - ordinary principles of negligence applied to 610–19
 - other occupiers' practice 614–15
 - Post-accident steps 614
 - precautionary steps 611–14
 - proof of 609–26
 - reasonable foreseeability 610–11
 - skilled visitors 619–20
 - statutory 'escape hatches' for occupier 619–26
 - warnings conveyed to visitors 620–21
- building standards 615–16
- causation 627
- cause of action 581–84
- child entrants 605–8
- children, premises dangerous to 593–94
- common duty of care 596–97, 603, 605
- contributory negligence 634–35
- dangers posed by premises 593–96
- defective premises 589–92
- defences 634–36
- definition of 'occupier' 585
- duty of care
 - proof of breach of 609–26

- occupiers' liability (*cont.*)
 towards trespassers 145, 628–34
 towards visitors 50, 145, 603–4
 duty to take positive steps 604
 exclusion by agreement 636
 hazards on property 147
 implied contractual term 604
 implied licence to enter 602–3
 to independent contractors 620–21
 joint occupiers 608–9
 landlords as occupiers 587–88
 as to lawful visitors (entrants) or trespassers 9
 legislative pre-requisites 585–96
 'occupier,' definition of 585
 occupier control, test of 585–87
 premises included in
 buildings and fixed structures 589
 land 589
 movable structures 589
 vessels 589
 wide variety 588–89
 remedies 637
 remoteness 627
 requisite standard of care 605–9
 risks
 non-obvious 618
 obvious 616–19
 skilled visitors to premises 619–20
 standard of care
 damage to adjoining landowners 327–29
 non-relevant matters as to 609
 Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 605–9
 proof of breach of 632–34
 requisite standard 605–9
 setting of 632
 statutory 'escape hatch' 633–34
 towards trespassers 632–34
 towards visitors 605–9
 static dangers
 application of OLA 1957 and OLA 1984 to 594–95
 definition of 593
 statutes governing 581
 trespassers
 categorisation as 597
 upgraded to visitor status 601–3
 visitors
 categorisation as 597
 downgraded to trespasser status 598–601
 employees 582–83
volenti 635–36
 Occupiers' Liability Act 1957
 activity dangers 594–95
 application of 581, 596–603
 causation 627
 implied licence to enter 602–3
 non-applicability of 582
 proof of breach of duty of care 609–26
 remoteness 627
 requisite standard of care 605–9
 static dangers 594–95
 trespassers
 categorisation as 597
 upgraded to visitor status 601–3
 visitors
 categorisation as 597
 downgraded to trespasser status 598–601
 duty of care towards 603–4
 protections under 1957 Act 603–27
 Occupiers' Liability Act 1984
 activity dangers 594–95
 application of 581, 596–603
 non-applicability of 582
 static dangers 594–95
 trespassers
 categorisation as 597
 duty of care towards 628–34
 upgraded to visitor status 601–3
 visitors
 categorisation as 597
 downgraded to trespasser status 598–601
 offer of amends 826–27
 omissions (pure)
 and actions/acts 143–45
 and 'bad Samaritan' liability 104
 causation and 469–70
 exceptional scenarios 145–48
 general rule of 142–45
 legal policy 143
 police forces and 91, 94–96
 public authorities 647–48
 opinions
 honest opinion *see* honest opinion
 public interest 817
Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Morts Dock & Engineering Co see Wagon Mound No 1
 owners of deregistered businesses, public authority liability 672
Page v Smith
 foreseeability of psychiatric harm 244–46
 judicial uncertainty as to 245
 normal fortitude rule 250–51
 pain and suffering
 PSLA damages 545
 time-frames of 553
 parents
 authority over children 730–31
JD v East Berkshire Community Health NHS Trust 666
 public policy factors as to duty of care 667
 wrongfully accused of sexually or physically abusing their children 665
 Parliamentary intention, construing
 see breach of statutory duty
 partnerships, capacity to sue for defamation 768
 passing-off, defined 6
 pecuniary damages *see* compensatory damages
 peer professional opinion *see* professionals
 peer-reviewed statements, defamation and 806–7
 personal injury
 awards, compared with damages 830
 duty of care *see* duty of care
 priority over economic loss 69, 110
 psychiatric harm as 217–18
 personal relationships *see* relationships
 photographs, defamation and 786–87
 physical harm *see* harm
Pleural Plaques litigation
 contrasting reasoning in 405–6
de minimis threshold of damage 403–8
 judicial responses to *Pleural Plaques* litigation 407–8
 legislative response to 407
 media commentary on 406
Polemis, Re 489–90
 police forces
 'agony of the moment' scenarios 315
 assumption of specific responsibility by 98–99
 core function 90
 dangerous situations created by 98
 defamatory publications 790

- duty of care 90
 and European Convention on Human Rights 101
 exceptional circumstances where duty is owed 98–100
 functions other than investigating or suppressing crime 100
Hill core principle
 background and application 91–94
 extension 100–1
 immunity from prosecution in negligence 90
 liability principle and 96–97
 ‘outrageous negligence’ by 100
 powers of arrest or detention 728
 pre-identified victims 96–97
 ‘prevention of crime, disorder, or ill-discipline,’ defence of 728–32
 public policy factors as to duty of care 92–93, 101
 public safety at risk from known danger 100
 ‘pure omissions’ rule 91, 94–96
 residuary claims of psychiatric 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
 confinement 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
 estoppel 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 539
 prospect of mental harm 537
 prospect of physical harm 537
 requisite-harm element 537–38
 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 specialisms 292–99
 conflicting professional opinions, validity for *Bolam* test 364–66
 defamation 775–78
 inexperienced 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 3, 9
 provocation, trespass to the person
 737–39
 proximity
Anns v Merton LBC
 causal 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
 geographical 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
 doctrine 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
 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 229
 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
 precondition 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
 remoteness 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

- 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 and normal fortitude rule 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, 43–244
- 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* 640–43
 - general principle as to liability 640–43
 - reasons for principle 642–43
 - timeline of two-stage test 644 and *Wednesbury* test 643–46
- ECHR and Article 6 and 676–78
- harmonisation of common law 679–81
- strike-out procedure 678–79
- taking actions to ECtHR 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, 46–647
 - ‘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 646–47
 - 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

1030 Index

- 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
 conflict 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
 fear-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
 ‘indeterminate liability problem’
 68, 103
 and individual liberty 103
- individual subordinated to public
 good 93
 individual subordinated to wider
 public good 70
 insurability and 110
 insurability factor 68
 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
 recklessness, 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

- 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 131–34
 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
Rylands v Fletcher liability
 accidental escapes 932
 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 932
 interests protected in 8
 knowledge of escape 930–32
 law reform 954–55
 mischief or danger test 929–30
 natural user of land 936–37
 ‘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 955
 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
 publishees 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
Caparo 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
 315
 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

1033 Index

- 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
 - ‘agony 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 326–32
 - 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 in tort and 18
 - damage to adjoining landowners 327–29
 - ‘diagnosis with a focus’ scenarios 316
 - disability (physical or mental), effect on 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
 - ‘agony 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, 323
 - 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

- Tarasoff* doctrine 164
 testamentary dispositions *see* wills
 third parties
 acts of strangers, as defence 635, 945–47
 failure to control, supervise or detain
 capacity to warn or protect 156
 compensation, means of 164–65
 conflict of duties and interests 162–63
 degree of control 155–56
 not a derivative duty 149–50
 diversion of police resources in duty of care litigation 162
 European Convention on Human Rights 165–66
 health authorities/practitioners 152
 implication of duty for other cases/sectors 165
 incremental test 165
 knowledge of propensities 156–57
 lack of control of dangerous persons 148–49
 leading cases 150–54
 leading cases, analysis of 154–66
 member of identifiable class at special risk 159–60
 omission to act 161
 practical problems of imposing duty to warn 161–62
 prior knowledge of at-risk person's identity 158
 prison officers 150–51
 proximity, relational 158
 proximity, temporal and geographic 157
 proximity factors summarised 160
 public policy factors as to duty of care 160–65
 reasonable foreseeability of harm 154–55
 requisite proximity 155–60
 schools 151–52
 size of class of at-risk persons 163–64
 social housing landlords 153–54
 successful cases 153
 Tarasoff Doctrine 164
 unsuccessful cases 154
- intervening acts
 conduct neither negligent nor criminal 464–65
 criminal or negligent acts 463–64
- time
 arising of public authority's duty of care 649
 date for assessing breach 339–42
 immediate aftermath doctrine *see* psychiatric harm
 temporal proximity 257–61
 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
 champerty 2
 compensatory function 10, 15–17
 concurrent actions, *Keegan v CC of Merseyside* and 16
 concurrent liability with contract 17
 conspiracy to injure 965
 contract law apportionment of risk contrasted 12
 contractor's authorised or ratified tort 1004
 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 483–84
- 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 685–87
 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 725–27
 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 730–31
 powers of arrest or detention 728
 prison confinement 729–30
 provocation defence 737–39

- remedies 739–48
- self-defence, defence of 732–34
- types of torts 685
- vindictory 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
 - Congenital Disabilities (Civil Liability) Act 1976 58–62
 - duty of care under 1976 Act 59–61
 - 'occurrence' of injuries, events leading to 58
 - standing to sue 61–62
 - wrongful conception claims 74–82
- unhelpful strangers *see* 'bad Samaritan' liability
- unincorporated associations, capacity to sue for defamation 769
- United States
 - statutory compensation scheme in Florida 14–15
 - Tarasoff* doctrine 164
- unreasonable user
 - balancing exercise, relevant factors 863–72
 - 'coming to the nuisance' 872–74
 - generally 861–62
 - negligence and 874–80
 - and 'physical interference' nuisances 862–63
 - proof of 861
 - 'user damages,' definition of 10
 - 'very thing' principle *see volenti*
- vessels, occupiers' liability 589
- vicarious liability
 - analytical approach to 964
 - arising of 343
 - assault 965
 - authorised tort 1004
 - battery 965
 - conspiracy to injure 965
 - definition of 963
 - direct liability distinguished from 966
 - dual liability 986–90
 - educational services 967
 - employees borrowed from contractor 1010
 - employees' role in 968–70
 - of employer 963–68
 - employers' liability for contractor's torts
 - arising of liability 1003
 - authorised or ratified tort 1004
 - employees borrowed from contractor 1010
 - general rule 1003
 - negligent selection of contractor 1004–6
 - non-delegable duties of care 1006–10
- employment connection aspect of gross negligence 997
- Irish law compared 992–93
- Lister v Hesley Hall Ltd* 991–93
- non-relevant tests 993–95
- Salmond* test 990–91
- scenarios 995
- employment relationship aspect of analysis of relationship 974
- distinction between employee and independent contractor 975–81
- ways of circumventing 974
- fraudulent misrepresentation 965
- health authorities 967
- introduction to 963
- Irish law compared 992–93
- law reform 969–70
- Lister v Hesley Hall Ltd* 991–93
- Lister v Romford Ice* 969–70
- loaned employees 981–86
- misfeasance in public office 965
- negligent selection of contractor 1004–6
- non-delegable duties of care 1006–10
- non-relevant tests 993–95
- police forces 967
- public authorities 639
- ratified tort 1004
- rationales for
 - 'deep pocket' 971
 - deterrence argument 973
 - enterprise benefit argument 972
 - enterprise risk argument 973
 - fault-based rationales 972–74
 - generally 970
 - loss distribution 972
 - protection of employee from financial ruin 972
 - selection argument 973
 - strict (no-fault) rationales 971–72
- size of potential liability 965–66
- systemic breach distinguished from 343–44
- types of torts 964–65
- victims
 - duty of care toward rescuers 53
 - of negligent misstatements 187–93
 - primary *see* psychiatric harm
 - secondary *see* psychiatric harm
- vindictory damages, trespass to the person 746–48
- vis major see act of vis major*
- visitors
 - categorisation as 597
 - causation and 627
 - downgraded to trespasser status 598–601
 - duty of care towards 603–4
 - occupiers' duty of care towards 50, 145, 596–603–604
 - Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 603–27
 - proof of breach of duty of care 609–26
 - remoteness and 627
 - requisite standard of care 605–9
 - skilled visitors to premises, occupiers' liability 619–20
 - standard of care towards 605–9
 - trespassers upgraded to status of 601–3
 - warnings conveyed by occupiers 620–21

- volenti*
 alternatives to 526–27
 analytical approach to 527
 appreciation-of-risks element 527–28
 bars to 533
 common law limits to 533
 consent to defendant's breach of duty 530–31
 criticisms of 534–35
 definition of 526
 elements of 527–33
 express consent 529–30
Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd and implied consent 529–30
 knowledge-of-risks element 527–29
 objective appreciation of risk 529
 occupiers' liability 635–36
 private nuisance 898–99
Rylands v Fletcher liability 949
 sports, appreciation of risks 528
 statutory interaction with 535
 statutory limits to 533
 subjective appreciation of risk 529
 theoretical bases for 533–34
 'very thing' principle 532–33
 voluntariness requirement 530
 voluntary consent, factors against 531–32
 voluntary-consent element 529–32
 voluntariness of children's actions 73
 voluntary assumption of responsibility/reliance/risk *see volenti*
- Vowles v. Evans*
 availability of insurance, duty of care and 72
 public policy factors as to duty of care 69
- Wagon Mound No 1*
 'guilt-ridden' primary victims of psychiatric harm 246
 remoteness of damage 489–90
 warnings
 in medical booklets/literature 138–39
 to skilled visitors by occupiers 620–21
 timing of 142
see also failure to warn
 web hosting, defamation and 793–95
 websites
 defamation and 791–93
 innocent dissemination 810
Wednesbury test 643–46
 wilful negligence, exemplary damages 573
Wilkinson v Downton rule
 actionable torts, need for proof of damage 8
 intentional infliction of mental distress or physical harm in 4
 intentional *vs.* non-intentional conduct 8
 interests protected in 8
 wills, *White v Jones* and negligent provision of services 203–6
Wilsher v Essex AHA 424–26
 difficulties with 309–11
 health authorities, limited availability of resources 332
 impact of 307–8
 standard of care 305
Wilsher rule as to standard of care 305
 workers' compensation scheme 13
 wrongful birth
 arising of 82
 definition 82
 father's separate claim 86
 mother's sole claim 85
 parents' joint claim 85
 preconditions for successful claim 84
 recoverable damages 84–85
 wrongful conception distinguished from 83–84
 wrongful life distinguished from 83
 wrongful conception
 arising of 74–75
 claims 74–82
 failed sterilisations
 Australian law compared 75–76
 disabled children resulting from 78–79
 of disabled mothers 79–81
 duty of care 75
 duty of care toward future sexual partners of patients 80–81
 heads of loss 76, 78, 80
 healthy children resulting from 75–78
 public policy factors as to recoverable costs 75–76, 79, 80–81
 wrongful birth distinguished from 83–84
 wrongful death *see* death
 wrongful interference *see* interference
 wrongful life
 arising of claims 124–25
 at common law 125–27
 other jurisdictions compared 126–27
 public policy factors as to duty of care 125
 statutory preclusions to claims 127–28
 wrongful birth distinguished from 83
- X (Minors) v Bedfordshire CC* *see Bedfordshire cases*