Class Six: Negligence

Origins of the tort of negligence

- → Early view that where there was a contract there was no room for tort
- → By 1932 increasing volume of cases seeking redress for indirectly caused harm → Urgent need for legal protection for those not protected by law of contract → Idea of 'foresight' in direct conflict with concerns raised in Winterbottom v Wright (1842)

Trespass

Trespass: starting point in the development of law of torts

- → Trespass vi et armis 12th century
 - o Direct and forcible interference
- → Tresspass on the case 13th century
 - o Indirect (consequential)
- → Although writ system has faded, it gave rise to causes of actions in both trespass and case which continue today
- → Must have a cause of action
 - Reflects substantive rules when pursuing any legal action

Modern Trespass

- → Trespass to land
- → Trespass to goods (chattels)

- → Trespass to the person
 - Battery, assault and false imprisonment

Negligence

- ightarrow Negligence is an action on the case damage is the gist of the action
- → Elements of tort comprising the cause of action:
 - o Defendant must have owed plaintiff duty of care (duty of care)
 - o That duty must have been breached (breach of duty)
 - o Plaintiff suffered injury which was reasonably foreseeable (damage/injury)
 - o Breach of duty must have caused damage to P (causation)

Doctrine of Precedent

- → Factual similarity and reasoning by analogy
- → Reasoning by analogy: when are cases alike?
 - o Identification of relevant 'material facts' which provide common ground
 - Inductive reasoning
 - Deductive reasoning

Doctrine of Precedent in Action – Cases

- → Langridge v Levy 1837: Imposition of duty of care to user would "open the floodgates and allow for indeterminate and infinite liability."
- → Winterbottom v Wright 1842: Could not consider negligence because the contract was between the Post Master General and the Coach Repairer: no connection between plaintiff and defendant
- → George v Skivington 1896: The duty under the contract should extend to those whom the seller knew would be using the product.
- → Heaven v Pender 1883 when 'duty of care' became English Law; A duty of care was owed to the person who was to use the platform, especially as it was during his employment
- → Donoghue v Stevenson 1932: neighbour principle; must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions that you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour