Torts Fall 2020 Mr. Sanders

Course Outline Christie, et al., 6th ed.

Week 1 pp. 1-40 Introduction & Intentional Torts

Introduction

The Aims of Tort Law
Adaptability to New Situations
Robertson v. Rochester Box
The History of Tort Law
The Forms of Action: Scott v. Shepard
What does it mean to be responsible?
The Modern Landscape

Intentional Torts

Intention: Beauchamp v. Dow Chem.; Wagner v. State

Week 2 pp. 40-88; 114-142 Intentional Torts, Continued

Battery: Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Comms., Inc

Assault: Dickens v. Puryear

Transferred Intent & Participation Liability: Singer v. Marx; Halberstam v. Welsh MAYBE SKIP

HALBERSTAM

False Imprisonment: McCann v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.; Fojtic v. Charter Medical Corp.

Trespass to Land: John Larkin, Inc. v. Marceau

Trespass to Chattel & Conversion

NOTE: We are skipping the materials on Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.

Defenses

Consent: Hellriegel v. Tholl; Reavis v. Slominski

Self Defense: Silas v. Bowen

Week 3 pp. 142-206 Intentional Torts & Negligence (Breach)

Intentional Torts Continued

Defenses, Cont.

Defense of Property: Brown v. Martinez

Discipline

Necessity: Ploof v. Putnam; Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co.

Negligence

Historical Development: *Brown v. Kendall* The Prima Facie Case of Negligence

The Standard of Care: Vaughan v. Menlove; Delair v. McAdoo;

Variations on the Standard of Care: Goss v. Allen; Creasy v. Rusk; Haley v. London Elec.

The Calculus of Risk: Barker v. City of Philadelphia

Week 4 pp. 206-277 Negligence (Breach)

The Calculus of Risk Continued: *U.S. v. Carroll Towing; Pitre v. Employers Liability Assurance Corp.*

Establishing the Standard of Care: the Function of Judge and Jury: *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. v. Goodman; Pokora v. Wabash Railway Co.*

Establishing the Standard of Care by Deference to the Legislature – Negligence per se: *Martin v. Herzog; Tedla v. Ellman; Barnum v. Williams; Perry v. S.N.*

Proof of Negligence – Custom and Expert Testimony

Custom: Dempsey v. Addison Crane

Malpractice: Shilkret v. Annapolis Emergency Hosp. Assn.; Helling v. Carey

Week 5 pp. 278-349 Negligence (Breach) & Negligence (Duty)

Negligence (Breach)

Malpractice, continued: Miller v. Kennedy

Circumstantial Evidence – Res Ipsa Loquitor: Byrne v. Boadle; Morejon v. Rais Construction Co.; Swiney v. Malone Freight Lines Inc.; Ybarra v. Spangard

Negligence (Duty)

What is Duty and How Do Courts Decide?

Foundational Duty Rules: *Thompson v. Kaczinski; Brown v. Kerr; Palsgraf v. Long Island R.R – Part 1*

Week 6 pp. 349-424 Negligence (Duty)

Affirmative Duties to Warn or Rescue: Price v, E.I Dupont de Nemours & Co.; Grimes v. Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.; Farwell v. Keaton; Maldonado v. Southern Pacific; Thompson v. County of Alameda; Uhr v. East Greenbush Central School Dist.

No Duty Based on Public Policy: Strauss v. Belle Realty Co.; Graff v. Beard

Week 7 pp. 424-463; 505-540; 560-577 Negligence (Duty)

Landowner Liability: Cochran v. Burger King, Inc.; Nelson v. Freeland' Bennett v. Stanley; Posecai v. Wal-Mart

Immunities (I will give a lecture on the various types of Immunities you should skim the material.) Special Duties Based on Type of Harm

Emotional Harm: Falzone v. Busch; Portee v. Jaffee; Catsouras v. California Highway Patrol; Boyles v. Kerr

Wrongful Life/Birth (We will skip over these materials. I will say a few words about these torts.)

Economic Harm: Aiken v. Debow

Week 8 pp. 579-653 Causation & Scope of Liability

Cause in Fact

General Principles

Establishing Causation -- Sufficiency of the Evidence: Stubbs v. City of Rochester, Daly v.

Bergstedt; General Electric v Joiner; Matsuyama v Birnbaum

Multiple Causes and Defendants: Kingston v. Chicago & Northwest Railway Co.; Summers v.

Tice; Sindell v. Abbott Laboratories

Scope of Liability

Introduction

Foundational Cases: In Re Polemis; Palsgraf v. Long Island R.R. Part II

Week 9 pp. 653-725 Scope of Liability & Plaintiff's Conduct

Scope of Liability Continued

Foundational Cases Continued: Wagon Mound I

Application in Newer Cases: Hughes v. Lord Advocate; Doughty v. Turner Mfg.; In re Kinsman;

Wagon Mound II

Intervening Cause: Latzel v. Bartek; Brauer v. N. Y. Central & Hutson River R.R.

Plaintiff's Conduct

Contributory Negligence: Butterfield v. Forrester

Week 10 pp. 725-822 Plaintiffs Conduct, Apportionment & Strict Liability

Plaintiff's Conduct and Apportionment

Comparative Negligence: Hoffman v. Jones; Bradley v. Appalachian Power Co.

Assumption of the Risk: La Frenz v. Lake County Fair Board; Jones v. Three Rivers

Management Corp.; Herod v. Grant; Auckenthaler v. Grundmeyer

Avoidable Consequences, Mitigation of Damages

Multiple Parties

Vicarious Liability: Wong-Leong v. Hawaiian Independent Refinery, Inc.; Jones v. Healthsouth

Treasure Valley Hospital

Imputed Contributory Negligence

Apportionment, Joint & Several Liability and Contribution: Walt Disney World Co. v. Wood

Strict Liability

Animals: Duren v. Kunkel

Week 11 pp. 822-905 Strict Liability; Products Liability

Strict Liability Continued

Dangerous Activities (Origins): Fletcher v. Rylands; Rylands v. Fletcher

Abnormally Dangerous Activities: Loose v. Buchannan; Klein v. Pyrodyne; Indiana Harbor Belt v. American Cynamid; Foster v. Preston Mill

The Coase Theorem

Products Liability

Negligence – Destroying the Privity Barrier: MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.

Breach of Warranty

Strict Liability in Torts: Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.

Week 12 pp. 905-995 Products Liability Continued

The Concept of Defect in Products Liability today

Manufacturing Defects: Smoot v. Mazda Motors

Design Defects: Branham v. Ford Motor Co.; Riley v. Becton Dickson

Warning Defects: Lewis v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc.; Burke v. Spartanics Ltd.; Feldman v.

Lederle Labs.

Defendants and Interests Covered by Products Liability

Defenses

Plaintiff's Behavior

Week 13 pp. 996-1058 Products Liability Continued and Nuisance

Products Liability Continued

Pre-Emption: Bates v. Dow Agrosciences LLC

Compliance with Regulations

Products Liability in Other Countries

Nuisance

NOTE: We will do as much of the nuisance chapter as time permits. If we run short of time we will move on to the damages chapter.

Overview (also reread the *Larkin* case on page 79)

Private Nuisance: Crosstex North Texas Pipeline v. Gardiner; Impellizerri v. Jamesville

Federated Church

Remedies: Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co.

Public Nuisance: State v. Lead Industries Association

Private Enforcement of a Public Nuisance: Graceland Corp. v. Consolidated Laundries Corp.

Week 14 pp. 1059-1149 Damages

Categories of Compensatory Damages: Seffert v. Los Angeles Transit Lines; Wainwright v.

Fontenot; McDougald v. Garber

Indirect Non-fatal Injury to Others (spousal and parent-child consortium): Roberts v. Williamson

Damages in Death-Related Tort Claims: Green v. Bittner

Attorney Fees and Contingency Fee.

Attendance: Students are expected to attend all classes. The usual law school attendance rules apply.

Exam: The examination is open book. It will be part multiple choice and part essay in about equal proportion.

Objectives: The objectives of the course are: to provide an overview of the law of torts, to help students develop their analytical skills, and to understand the role of tort law in society.

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) can help students who are having difficulties managing stress, adjusting to the demands of a professional program, or feeling sad and hopeless. You can reach CAPS (www.uh.edu/caps) by calling 713-743-5454 during and after business hours for routine appointments or if you or someone you know is in crisis. No appointment is necessary for the "Let's Talk" program, a drop-in consultation service at convenient locations and hours around campus. http://www.uh.edu/caps/outreach/lets_talk.html