

<i>Adeels Palace v Moubarak</i>	2009, HCA	Occupier-entrant Causation	At D's restaurant that also functioned as a night club, trouble broke out between patrons on the dance floor. One of them left the premises, obtained a firearm and, on his return, shot the respondents. There were no licensed security guards on duty at the time.
<i>Agar v Hyde</i>	2000, HCA	Sports injury Omission Lack of control to impose duty	Two men, aged <u>18 and 19</u> at the time, broke their necks playing rugby union. Suing international rugby board, Ps contended that the board owed them a duty of care to amend rules and avoid dangers, and pointed out that he rules had been amended
<i>Annetts v Australian Stations</i>	2002, HCA	Pure mental harm	P's son dies from dehydration working as jackaroo on D's cattle station, after D assures P's son will be looked after.
<i>Attwells v Jackson Lalic Lawyers</i>	2016, HCA	Advocate immunity Public policy	Advocate's immunity does not extend to advice that leads to a <u>settled agreement between parties</u> to litigation.
<i>Bourhill v Young</i>	1943, House of Lords	[road user]	P suffered miscarriage as result of nervous shock after <u>hearing but not seeing</u> collision and seeing blood on the road. P sued the motorcyclist contributing to the collision.
<i>Bowditch v McEwan</i>	2003, Qld CA	Mother-foetus	P was injured in a motor vehicle accident and was born disabled due to injuries suffered in the collision. D mother driver owes a duty of care to others within the vehicle, including any foetus within a passenger. That the foetus is within the driver is only incidentally relevant. Consideration of insurance recovery
<i>Bugge v Brown</i>	1919, HCA	Vicarious liability	D grazier instructed his roustabout, Winter, to go to a distant section of the property to cut thistles. D's wife, because Winter's terms of employment included his keep, packed the roustabout a box containing food and a large frying-pan. D noticed that frying pan and, thinking it too large a utensil to be taken on a work party, instructed the roustabout to go to another place on the land, where there was a house and a frying pan, to cook his lunch. Winter disobeyed this instruction, and lit his cooking fire at a spot closer to his work. Owing to his negligence, the fire spread and burnt out P Bugge's property.
<i>Bujidoso v NSW</i>	2005, HCA	Prisoner-gaoler	P had been convicted on a guilty plea of three counts of sexual assault on minors. During

			reason, that required him to leave the respondent alone with the doctor during the victim's treatment. Stringent implementation of the buddy system insisted upon by P constable would create tension between police officers, and the police officer's duty of keep the community safe warrants police officers being exposed to certain harm.
<i>Ffrench v Sestili</i>	2008, SASCFC	Vicarious liability	P, disabled by quadriplegia, was defrauded of large sums of money by her carer. The carer's employer was held vicariously liable.
<i>Geyer v Downs</i>	1977, HCA	School-pupil Degree of control	A pupil aged eight was severely injured in the small and crowded playground of the school at 8.50 am when she was accidentally struck by a softball bat wielded in a game by another girl. Lessons started at 9.30 am; and teachers were required by the rules of the Education Department to be on duty from 9 am. However, the headmaster of the school <u>had permitted, though not encouraged, the children to enter the school grounds well before 9 am.</u> He was <u>aware that many children habitually played in the playground before school hours, and had expressly forbidden the children to play games or run around in the school grounds before 9 am,</u> admonitions which he knew had proved ineffective. He had personally <u>exercised occasional superintendence of the playground before 9 am</u> and had instructed teachers who might be passing through the schoolground before that time to ensure that the children were obeying his directions, but he took no measures to ensure regular supervision by teachers of the children before 9 am.
<i>Gittani Stone v Pavkovic</i>	2007, NSWCA	Remoteness Manner in which the harm eventuates	P employee was shot and injured by a fellow worker, between whom there has been a history of conflicts known to D employer
<i>Graham Barclay Oyster v Ryan</i>	2002, HCA	Public authority	Group action brought on behalf of consumers who contracted HAV from contaminated oysters grown in a lake in NSW. The State's liability was said to rest in part on its obligations to <u>undertake and enforce an oyster quality assurance program</u> in the area. The need for the State to take this and other action was said to arise because of the extent of knowledge it had acquired over some years about the risk of contamination of <u>the water and of viral contamination of water,</u> and also because of the <u>extent of its involvement in the management and practice of the oyster industry.</u>

				let him proceed home, where he later committed suicide. P respondent sued D officers, alleging that they owed both her and her husband a duty to take reasonable care to protect them from reasonably foreseeable risks of harm, including the infliction of self-harm by the husband.
<i>Sullivan v Moody</i>	2001, HCA	Salient features Child abuse		
<i>Sutherland SC v Heyman</i>	1985, HCA	Omission		In 1975 Ps purchased a house in Sutherland Shire. During 1976 serious structural defects appeared in it due to subsidence, the house having been erected with inadequate footings on a steep slope. The D Council had approved plans and issued a building permit for the site in 1968. The house, in course of erection, was inspected by officers of the Council who, if they directed their attention to the matter (as to which there was no evidence), failed to notice that fewer footings were installed than were contemplated by the plans and that those installed were structurally weak. The respondents sought no statutory certificate of compliance from the Council and <u>made no other inquiry of it about such matters.</u>
<i>Tame v NSW</i>	2002, HCA	Public authority Pure mental harm		
<i>Thompson v Johnson and Johnson</i>	1991, HCA	Manufacturer Breach		P consumer argued that reasonable manufacturer would have notified medical practitioners about the possible defects, which would in turn facilitate the correct diagnosis of her symptoms.
<i>Vairy v Wyong SC</i>	2005, HCA	Public authority		P sustained an injury while diving from a rock platform in an area controlled by D council. The rock platform was near a popular beach and was <u>commonly used for diving</u> . An accident similar to P's accident had occurred at the same location some 15 years earlier. The earlier accident received widespread publicity. P sued the council on the basis that the council knew of the risk to divers and was negligent in failing to erect a warning sign, or alternatively, failing to prohibit diving from the platform altogether.
<i>Vazza v Tooth</i>	1964, HCA	Employer-employee Burden of taking precautions		P's hand was badly cut when a bottle burst as he was removing it from a pasteuriser. There was insufficient evidence that it would have been reasonable either to install a system for the mechanical handling of the bottle or that it would have been practical to