INTENTIONAL TORTS	s3B exclusion
-------------------	---------------

Exemplary, nominal, aggrave		ted damages	
TRESPASS TO PERSON			
Assault		2	
Battery		3	
False imprisonment		4	
TRESPASS TO LAND		5	
DEFENCES TO INTENTIONAL TORTS			
Self defence		7	
Consent		8	
Necessity		8	
Child D		9	
ACTION ON THE CASE (Intentional inc	direct nervous shock)	9	
NUISANCE			
Private		10	
Public		11	
NEGLIGENCE	s5 harm- personal injury, death, property damage, economic loss		
DEATH		12	
DUTY OF CARE OWED			
Established duty areas		12	
Omissions		13	
Statutory authorities		14	
, Vicarious liability		15	
Non delegable duty		16	
Mental harm of other		16	
Pure economic loss		18	
NOVEL DUTY		20	
BREACH DUTY		21	
(Remember s 42 statutory au	thority)		
CAUSATION		23	
REMOTENESS		25	
Egg shell skull		26	
DEFENCES TO NEGLIGENCE		27	
Contributory negligence		27	
Intoxication + contributory negl	igence	28	
Volenti non fit injuria		28	
· ·	, recreational, illegality, samaritan, volunteers, professionals	29	
CONTRIBUTION AMONG TORTFEASO		32	
STATUTORY SCHEMES			
Motor accidents compensation	nn	32	
Workers compensation	~··	33	

INTENTIONAL TORTS

TRESPASS TO PERSON

Onus of proof on P to prove facts and then shifts to D to prove lack of fault.

ASSAULT s3B exclusion

ACTIONABLE PER SE (NO DAMAGE)!

- 1. Voluntary intentional (or negligent) act
- 2. Directly causing
- 3. Ps reasonable apprehension (OBJECTIVE)
- 4. Imminent physical bodily contact

Zanker v Vartokas

1. VOLUNTARY INTENTIONAL ACT

- Words can constitute
 - Barton v Armstrong: D Armstrong (powerful) threatened over phone to take Barton's life if he didn't sign dead. Liable.
 - Rosza v Samuels: P taxi driver threatened to punch D taxi driver. D gets knife and makes conditional threat to P 'I'll cut you to bits if you try it'. D had other options. Liable.
- Silence
- R v Ireland: Silent night time calls sufficed.

2. DIRECTLY CAUSING

- Can be continuation of act
 - Scott v Shepherd: D threw lighted squib into marketplace, passed along, blinded P. Liable.
- Followed so immediately upon the act that it may be deemed part of the act
 - Hutchins v Maughan: D laid poisoned bait on ground. P warned of baits. Ps dogs ate the bait. Held harm was consequential as laying of baits didn't cause harm, it was the dogs' eating.

3. PS REASONABLE APPREHENSION (OBJECTIVE)

- Must have knowledge of threat
- Reasonable person test
- Unless D knows P is exceptionally timid and used this
 - MacPherson v Beath
- Pointing gun even when not loaded
 - Brady v Schatzel

4. IMMINENT PHYSICAL BODILY CONTACT

- Doesn't necessarily relate to immediacy in time → continuing fear
 - Zanker v Vartokas: P gets into Ds van, D accelerated and threatened sexual activity at friend's house, P tries to escape. Violence imminent as it would occur immediately at end of imprisonment. Liable.

Barton v Armstrong: D Armstrong threatened over phone to take Barton's life if he didn't sign dead. No indication as to when he would carry it out. Held imminent.

Conditional threat → assault when associated with imminent force

Rosza v Samuels: P taxi driver threatens to punch D taxi driver. D gets knife and makes conditional threat to P 'I'll cut you to bits if you try it'. D had other options. Liable.

BATTERY s3B exclusion

ACTIONABLE PER SE (NO DAMAGE)!

- 1. Voluntary intentional (or negligent) act
- 2. Directly causing
- 3. Physical bodily contact
- 4. Without consent of P

Scott v Shepherd

1. VOLUNTARY INTENTIONAL ACT

• Must be a positive act not an omission

Can be negligent

- McHale v Watson: Boy D threw piece of steel at tree when girl P was hit causing blindness.
- Can be reckless
 - Williams v Milotin: Truck driver hit boy on bicycle.

2. DIRECTLY CAUSING

- Can be continuation of act
 - Scott v Shepherd: D threw lighted squib into marketplace, passed along, blinded P. Liable.
- Followed so immediately upon the act that it may be deemed part of the act
 - Hutchins v Maughan: D laid poisoned bait on ground. P warned of baits. Ps dogs ate the bait. Held harm was consequential as laying of baits didn't cause harm, it was the dogs eating.

3. PHYSICAL BODILY CONTACT

- Outside realms of everyday contact
 - Collins v Wilcock: D policewoman grabbed P prostitute by arm to gain attention. D used an unreasonable amount of force for contact of situation. Liable.
- Hostility irrelevant
 - Rixon v Star City: Worker tapped Rixon on shoulder and spun him around to tell him that he was an excluded person. No battery because he was merely trying to get attention. Not liable.
- Can be through an object
 - Scott v Shepherd: Lighted squib

4. WITHOUT CONSENT OF P

Defence to be pleaded and proven by D (Marion's case)

- Giumelli v Johnston: D raised elbow violently into P during AFL game. Did not consent to unusually forceful and deliberate contact that falls outside rules.
- Without knowledge