## Part 1 Tort of Negligence (Cases for Review)

Duty of care – some recognized categories

Occupier to visitors	Fact: Plaintiff [Zaluzna, respondent] went into
Australian Safeway Stores Pty Ltd v Zaluzna	the Defendant's store [Australia Safeway,
	appellant]
	It was raining outside so the foyer was wet and
	the defender slipped and injured himself
	The Plaintiff sued for negligence
	Findings: Courts rejected the traditional
	approach to occupiers' liability, and ecided that
	from now on the general duty of care formula
	under Donoghue v Stevenson should be
	applied to all cases.
	Here we have a commercial relationship as well
	as reasonable foreseeability, therefore there is
	a duty of care.
	Court argued that when you expect people to
	come into your shop and pay you money, the
	least you can do is provide a safe environment.
Donoghue v Stevenson	Fact: Mrs Donoghue went to a cafe with a
	friend. The friend brought her a bottle of
	ginger beer and an ice cream. The ginger beer
	came in an opaque bottle so that the contents
	could not be seen. Mrs Donoghue poured half
	the contents of the bottle over her ice cream
	and also drank some from the bottle. After
	eating part of the ice cream, she then poured
	the remaining contents of the bottle over the
	ice cream and a decomposed snail emerged
	from the bottle. Mrs Donoghue suffered
	personal injury as a result. She commenced a
	claim against the manufacturer of the ginger
	beer
	Findings: Her claim was successful. This case
	established the modern law of negligence and
	established the neighbour test.
Grant v The Australian Knitting Mills	Fact: Dr. Grant, the plaintiff, contracted a
_	severe case of dermatitis as a result of wearing
	woolen underpants which had been
	manufactured by the defendants (Australian
	Knitting Mills Ltd). The garment in question
	was alleged to contain an excess of sulphite.
	Upon purchase, he wore them for one entire
	1 12 1 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11

week without washing them beforehand.