

CONTENTS

<i>Table of Problems</i>	<i>xxv</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxxii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	1
A. In General	1
B. Categories of Tort Law	1
C. Organization of This Book	2
D. Typical Stages of Tort Litigation	3
E. How Tort Law Works Now: An Empirical View	4
<i>Michael J. Saks, Do We Really Know Anything About the Behavior of the Tort Litigation System—And Why Not?</i>	5
F. How Tort Law Serves Society	8
<i>Steven D. Smith, The Critics and the “Crisis”: A Reassessment of Current Conceptions of Tort Law</i>	12
2 INTENTIONAL TORTS	17
A. Introduction	17
B. Battery	17
1. Intent to Contact	18
<i>Waters v. Blackshear</i>	18
<i>Polmatier v. Russ</i>	21
Perspective: Historical Developments	26
2. Intending Contact That Is Harmful	26
<i>Nelson v. Carroll</i>	27
Perspective: Judgments as a Matter of Law	31
3. Intending a Contact That Is Offensive	32
<i>Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc.</i>	32
<i>Andrews v. Peters</i>	33
	ix

Perspective: Motion for a Directed Verdict	36
<i>White v. Muniz</i>	36
4. Damages for Intentional Torts	42
<i>Taylor v. Barwick</i>	42
Perspective: Summary Judgment	45
C. Assault	46
1. Intending Apprehension of Imminent Contact	46
<i>Cullison v. Medley</i>	46
<i>Brower v. Ackerley</i>	48
Perspective: Motion to Dismiss	53
2. Transfer of Intent Among People and Between Torts	53
<i>Hall v. McBryde</i>	54
Perspective: Transferred Intent	56
D. Defenses to Assault and Battery	57
1. Consent	57
<i>McQuiggan v. Boy Scouts of America</i>	58
Perspective: Who Proves Consent?	60
<i>Hogan v. Tavzel</i>	61
<i>Richard v. Mangion</i>	63
<i>Statute: Disturbing the Peace</i>	67
2. Defense of Self and Others—The Proportionality Principle	68
<i>Slayton v. McDonald</i>	69
<i>Young v. Warren</i>	72
<i>Statute: Use of Deadly Physical Force Against an Intruder</i>	75
<i>Statute: Use or Threatened Use of Force in Defense of a Person</i>	75
<i>Statute: Home Protection; Use of Deadly Force; Presumption of</i>	
<i>Fear of Death or Great Bodily Harm</i>	76
3. Defense of Land and Personal Property	77
<i>Woodard v. Turnipseed</i>	77
<i>Statute: Force in Defense of Property</i>	83
<i>Statute: Use of Force for the Protection of Property</i>	83
<i>Statute: Use of Force in Defense of Premises or Personal Property</i>	83
E. False Imprisonment	84
1. Intent	84
<i>Vumbaca v. Terminal One Group Ass'n L.P.</i>	85
2. Confinement and Consent	87
<i>Barrett v. Watkins</i>	87
<i>Zavala v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i>	89
3. The Shopkeeper's Privilege	95
<i>Padlo v. VG's Food Center, Inc.</i>	95
<i>Statute: Detention and Search in Theft of Library Materials and</i>	
<i>Shoplifting</i>	101

F. Infliction of Emotional Distress	102
1. Outrageousness	103
<i>Zalnis v. Thoroughbred Datsun Car Co.</i>	103
<i>Strauss v. Cilek</i>	106
2. Severe Emotional Distress	109
<i>Rogers v. Louisville Land Co.</i>	109
3. Intent and Recklessness	115
<i>Dana v. Oak Park Marina, Inc.</i>	115
Perspective: Frontiers of the Outrage Tort	117
4. Transferred Intent for Infliction of Emotional Distress	118
<i>Green v. Chicago Tribune Co.</i>	118
3. NEGLIGENCE: THE DUTY OF REASONABLE CARE	123
A. Introduction	123
B. The “Reasonable Person” Standard	125
1. Defining and Justifying the “Reasonable Person” Standard	125
<i>Vaughan v. Menlove</i>	125
Perspective: Law and Gender	127
<i>Parrot v. Wells, Fargo & Co. (The Nitro-Glycerine Case)</i>	127
Perspective: Social Costs and Benefits	130
2. Reasonable Conduct as a Balancing of Costs and Benefits	130
<i>McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc.</i>	130
Perspective: Law and Economics	135
C. The Range of Application of the Reasonable Person Standard	135
1. Especially Dangerous Instrumentalities	135
<i>Stewart v. Motts</i>	135
Perspective: Explicit and Implicit Overruling	140
2. Emergencies	140
<i>Myhaver v. Knutson</i>	140
3. An Actor’s Knowledge and Skill	143
<i>Cervelli v. Graves</i>	144
Perspective: The Reasonable Person Test and Juror Discretion	147
4. Youth: Special Treatment for Minors	148
<i>Robinson v. Lindsay</i>	148
Perspective: Fairness to Victims?	152
<i>Peterson v. Taylor</i>	152
<i>Statute: Liability of Parent or Guardian for Willful Destruction of Property by Infant Under 18</i>	156
<i>Statute: Liability of Parent for Willful Injury to Public Transportation Utility by Minor</i>	156

<i>Statute: Parental Liability for Willful, Malicious or Criminal Acts of Children</i>	156
<i>Statute: Natural Guardian; Liability for Torts of Child</i>	157
5. Physical and Mental Disabilities	158
<i>Poyner v. Loftus</i>	158
<i>Creasy v. Rusk</i>	162
Perspective: Scientific Knowledge and Judges' Knowledge	167
D. Recklessness	168
<i>Sandler v. Commonwealth</i>	168
Perspective: Recklessness in the Contexts of Neuroscience and Neuroeconomics	174
4. PROVING BREACH	175
A. Introduction	175
B. Violation of a Statute	176
<i>Martin v. Herzog</i>	176
<i>Thomas v. McDonald</i>	179
<i>Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Co. v. Matlock</i>	184
<i>Sikora v. Wenzel</i>	188
<i>Statute: Breach of Duty—Evidence of Negligence—Negligence Per Se</i>	194
<i>Statute: Due Care; Failure to Exercise</i>	194
C. Industry Custom	195
<i>The T.J. Hooper</i>	195
<i>Ludman v. Davenport Assumption High School</i>	197
Perspective: Compliance with Custom as “Only Some Evidence”	202
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Wright</i>	203
D. Res Ipsa Loquitur	205
<i>Byrne v. Boadle</i>	206
<i>Shull v. B.F. Goodrich Co.</i>	208
<i>Dover Elevator Co. v. Swann</i>	214
Perspective: Counter-Intuitive Statistical Likelihood of Negligence	218
5. LEGAL CAUSE: CAUSE-IN-FACT	221
A. Introduction	221
B. Basic Cause-in-Fact: The But-for Test	222
<i>Cay v. State of Louisiana, Department of Transportation and Development</i>	222

Perspective: But-for Cause and Toxic Substances	226
<i>Lyons v. Midnight Sun Transportation Services, Inc.</i>	227
<i>Aegis Insurance Services, Inc. v. 7 World Trade Company, L.P.</i>	228
Perspective: Moral Role of Causation	232
C. Alternatives to the But-for Test	232
1. Reasons for Alternatives	232
2. Multiple Sufficient Causes	233
<i>Kingston v. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.</i>	233
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Boomer</i>	237
Perspective: Preemptive Causes	244
3. Concert of Action	244
<i>Shinn v. Allen</i>	245
4. Alternative Liability	249
<i>Summers v. Tice</i>	250
<i>Burke v. Schaffner</i>	254
Perspective: Alternative Liability	258
5. Market Share Liability	258
<i>Suffolk County Water Authority v. The Dow Chemical Company</i>	259
Statute: Actions to Be Commenced Within Three Years	261
Statute: Certain Actions to Be Commenced Within Three Years of Discovery	261
<i>State of New Hampshire v. Exxon Mobil Corporation</i>	262
<i>Black v. Abex Corp.</i>	268
Perspective: Fungibility and Market Share Liability	273
6. Liability for Lost Chance of Recovery or for Increased Risk of Eventual Harm	274
<i>Matsuyama v. Birnbaum</i>	274
<i>Petriello v. Kalman</i>	279
6. LIMITS ON LIABILITY: DUTY AND PROXIMATE CAUSE	285
A. Introduction	285
<i>Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.</i>	286
Perspective: Duty as a Question of Law	293
B. Duty	293
<i>Hegyes v. Unjian Enterprises, Inc.</i>	294
<i>Dykema v. Gus Macker Enterprises, Inc.</i>	296
<i>Graff v. Beard</i>	299
Statute: Civil Liability for Social Hosts	302
Statute: Civil Liability of Persons Providing Alcoholic Beverages	303
<i>Kubert v. Best</i>	304

C. Proximate Cause	310
1. Introduction	310
2. Directness	311
<i>In re an Arbitration Between Polemis and Furness, Withy & Co., Ltd</i>	311
<i>Laureano v. Louzoun</i>	313
<i>Statute: Occupational Diseases; Proximate Causation</i>	315
<i>Statute: Governmental Immunity from Tort Liability</i>	315
Perspective: The Necessity of a Proximate Cause Doctrine	316
3. Substantial Factor	317
<i>American Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Thorne Equipment Co.</i>	317
<i>Chelcher v. Spider Staging Corp.</i>	320
<i>Taylor v. Jackson</i>	322
4. Foreseeability	325
a. Linking Liability to Foreseeability	325
<i>Tieder v. Little</i>	326
Perspective: Who Decides Whether a New Cause of Action Is Valid?	330
b. Relating the “Eggshell Plaintiff” Rule to a Foreseeability Analysis	331
<i>Schafer v. Hoffman</i>	331
c. Difficulty in Applying Foreseeability Analysis	335
<i>Petition of Kinsman Transit Co.</i>	336
5. The Restatement (Third) Approach to Duty and Proximate Cause	341
a. Duty	341
<i>A.W. v. Lancaster County School District 0001</i>	341
<i>Kimminau v. City of Hastings</i>	347
<i>Thompson v. Kaczinski</i>	351
6. Combining Approaches	356
<i>Statute: Legislative Findings; Proximate Cause</i>	357
<i>Statute: Proximate Cause; Standard of Proof</i>	357
7. Intervening and Superseding Forces	358
a. In General	358
b. When Is an Intervening Force Treated as Superseding?	359
<i>Price v. Blaine Kern Artista, Inc.</i>	359
<i>McClenahan v. Cooley</i>	361
c. Analyzing Intervening Forces Under the Proximate Cause Analysis	365
<i>Barry v. Quality Steel Products, Inc.</i>	365
<i>Statute: Proximate Cause</i>	371
Perspective: Superseding Causes and the Direct Cause Test	371
d. Negligent Treatment of a Plaintiff’s Injury: Intervening or Superseding?	372
<i>Weems v. Hy-Vee Food Stores, Inc.</i>	372
<i>Corbett v. Weisband</i>	374
<i>Statute: Effect Upon Chain of Proximate Cause</i>	379
<i>Statute: Intervening Forces; Proximate Causation</i>	380

7. DEFENSES	381
A. Introduction	381
B. Plaintiff's Contributory Fault	381
1. Traditional Common Law Treatment of a Plaintiff's Negligence	382
<i>Wright v. Norfolk and Western Railway Co.</i>	382
Perspective: Contributory Negligence and Incentives to Avoid Accidents	385
2. Modern Comparative Treatment of a Plaintiff's Negligence	386
<i>McIntyre v. Balentine</i>	387
<i>Dobson v. Louisiana Power & Light Co.</i>	390
Statute: Comparative Fault	393
Statute: Comparative Fault; Effect	393
Perspective: Jury Nullification of Modified Comparative Negligence?	394
Statute: Negligence Cases—Comparative Negligence as a Measure of Damages	394
Perspective: Incentive Effects of Comparative Negligence	395
<i>Jensen v. Intermountain Health Care, Inc.</i>	395
3. Reckless Conduct	399
<i>Coleman v. Hines</i>	399
<i>Downing v. United Auto Racing Association</i>	402
Perspective: Last Clear Chance in Modern Practice	407
Statute: Effect of Contributory Fault; Definition	407
Statute: Joint Tortfeasors, Liability	408
Statute: Comparative Fault	408
Perspective: Balancing Reckless and Negligent Conduct	409
C. Assumption of Risk	409
1. Express Assumption of Risk	410
<i>Wagenblast v. Odessa School District</i>	410
<i>Turnbough v. Ladner</i>	415
Statute: Express Assumption of Risk	419
Statute: Waiver of Liability	419
2. Implied Assumption of Risk	420
<i>Schroyer v. McNeal</i>	421
<i>Davenport v. Cotton Hope Plantation Horizontal Property Regime</i>	425
D. Mitigation and Avoidable Consequences	431
<i>Miller v. Eichhorn</i>	431
<i>Klanseck v. Anderson Sales & Service, Inc.</i>	432
<i>Law v. Superior Court</i>	433
Statute: Fault	437
Statute: Failure to Comply; Fault; Liability of Insurer; Mitigation of Damages	437

E. Immunities	438
1. Sovereign Immunity	438
<i>Statute: United States as a Defendant</i>	439
<i>Statute: Liability of the United States</i>	439
<i>Statute: Exceptions</i>	439
<i>Coulthurst v. United States</i>	441
Perspective: Competencies of Branches of Government	446
<i>In re World Trade Center Bombing Litigation</i>	447
2. Intrafamilial Immunity	451
<i>Boone v. Boone</i>	451
<i>Broadwell v. Holmes</i>	454
F. Statutes of Limitation and Repose	458
<i>Hanley v. Citizens Bank of Massachusetts</i>	459
<i>Kern v. St. Joseph's Hospital</i>	461
<i>Sedar v. Knowlton Construction Co.</i>	463
<i>Statute: Effect of Disability</i>	466
<i>Statute: Claim by Minor Against Provider of Health Care; Limitations</i>	466
<i>Statute: Ten Years; Developer, Contractor, Architect, Etc.</i>	467
<i>Statute: Limitation of Actions</i>	467
8. APPORTIONMENT OF DAMAGES	469
A. Introduction	469
B. Apportioning Damages Among Liable Defendants	470
1. Joint and Several Liability	470
<i>Carolina, C. & O. Ry. et al. v. Hill</i>	471
<i>Lacy v. CSX Transportation, Inc.</i>	473
<i>Sitzes v. Anchor Motor Freight, Inc.</i>	477
2. Several Liability	480
<i>Piner v. Superior Court</i>	480
<i>Statute: Recovery of Damages Based on Party's Responsibility</i>	485
<i>Statute: Joint Tort-Feasors; Nature of Liability</i>	485
<i>Statute: Abolition of Joint and Several Liability; Exceptions</i>	486
<i>Roderick v. Lake</i>	487
Perspective: Fairness and Several Liability	491
3. Allocating Responsibility to Absent or Immune Actors	491
<i>Sullivan v. Scoular Grain Co. of Utah</i>	492
4. Intentional Conduct in a Comparative Setting	497
<i>Slack v. Farmers Insurance Exchange</i>	498
Perspective: Restatement (Third) and Responsibility for Intentional Actors' Wrongdoing	504

5. Allocating the Risk of Insolvency	504
<i>Statute: Liability of Multiple Tortfeasors for Damages</i>	505
<i>Statute: Apportionment of Damages</i>	505
C. Vicarious Liability	506
1. Respondeat Superior	506
<i>Trahan-Laroche v. Lockheed Sanders, Inc.</i>	507
Perspective: Rationale for <i>Respondeat Superior</i>	510
<i>O'Connor v. McDonald's Restaurants of California, Inc.</i>	510
Perspective: Relating "Deep Pocket" to Enterprise and Risk Avoidance Theories	516
<i>Santiago v. Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.</i>	516
2. Vicarious Liability for Vehicle Owners	521
<i>Levitt v. Peluso</i>	521
Perspective: Use and Operation of a Motor Vehicle	525
9. PROFESSIONALS	527
A. Introduction	527
B. Professional Standard's Basic Definition and Rationale	527
<i>Osborn v. Irwin Memorial Blood Bank</i>	527
Perspective: Class Allegiance	532
<i>Nowatske v. Osterloh</i>	532
Perspective: Custom-Based Standards	537
<i>Rossell v. Volkswagen of America</i>	538
C. Applying the Professional Standard in Medical Cases	543
1. Geographic Scope of Professional Standard	543
<i>Vergara v. Doan</i>	543
<i>Statute: Standard of Acceptable Professional Practice</i>	545
<i>Statute: Community Standard</i>	546
Perspective: Legislative and Judicial Roles	547
2. Common Knowledge	547
<i>McGraw v. St. Joseph's Hospital</i>	547
<i>Statute: Presumption of Negligence</i>	551
Perspective: Malpractice Litigation and the Quality of Medical Care	552
3. Informed Consent	552
<i>Largey v. Rothman</i>	553
<i>Statute: Plaintiff's Burden of Proof for Informed Consent Claims</i>	557
Perspective: Informed Consent	559
4. Identifying the Defendant	559
<i>Ybarra v. Spangard</i>	559
Perspective: Using <i>Res Ipsa</i> to Identify Defendants	565

D. Legal Malpractice	565
<i>Russo v. Griffin</i>	566
<i>Bevan v. Fix</i>	569
<i>Fishman v. Brooks</i>	572
<i>Carbone v. Tierney</i>	576
10. OWNERS AND OCCUPIERS OF LAND	583
A. Introduction	583
B. Traditional Rules	583
1. Trespassers	583
<i>Ryals v. United States Steel Corp.</i>	584
<i>Merrill v. Central Maine Power Co.</i>	587
<i>Hill v. National Grid</i>	589
Statute: <i>Liability for Certain Injuries</i>	593
Statute: <i>Title to Property and Restrictions on Use, Ownership, and</i> <i>Alienation: Definitions</i>	593
Statute: <i>Liability of Owners or Occupiers of Land for Injury to</i> <i>Guests or Trespassers</i>	593
Perspective: <i>Deterrence and Corrective Justice Rationales for</i> <i>Limited Liability to Trespassers</i>	594
2. Licensees and Invitees	595
<i>Knorpp v. Hale</i>	595
Statute: <i>Actions Against Landowners</i>	599
Statute: <i>Duty of Owner of Premises to Licensee</i>	600
Statute: <i>Standard of Care Owed Social Invitee</i>	600
<i>Richardson v. The Commodore, Inc.</i>	601
3. Specific Rules for Particular Hazards to Legal Entrants	604
<i>Nisivoccia v. Glass Gardens, Inc.</i>	605
<i>Valance v. VI-Doug, Inc.</i>	610
<i>Seibert v. Vic Regnier Builders, Inc.</i>	613
Perspective: <i>Allocating Crime Prevention Resources</i>	619
4. Liability to Tenants and Their Guests	619
<i>Borders v. Roseberry</i>	620
C. Modern Approaches	625
1. Rejection of the Three-Category System	625
<i>Nelson v. Freeland</i>	625
<i>Foster v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i>	630
Statute: <i>Immunity from Liability; Injuries or Death Occurring on</i> <i>Property During or After the Commission of Certain Felonies</i>	634
Perspective: <i>Efficiency of Common Law Rules</i>	635

2. Changes in Landlord-Tenant Doctrines	636
<i>Newton v. Magill</i>	636
Perspective: Best Cost Avoider	640

11. SPECIAL DUTY RULES 641

A. Introduction	641
B. Duty to Rescue or Protect	641
1. General No-Duty-to-Rescue Rule and Its Exceptions	641
<i>Lundy v. Adamar of New Jersey, Inc.</i>	642
Statute: Good Samaritans	647
Statute: Liability of Physician, Dentist, Nurse, or Emergency Medical Technician for Rendering Emergency Care	647
Statute: Emergency Medical Care	648
Statute: Good Samaritan Law Duty to Assist	648
Statute: Duty to Render Assistance	649
Statute: Failure to Seek Assistance	649
Statute: Duty to Aid Victim or Report Crime	649
Perspective: Individualism, Altruism, and Duty to Rescue	650
Perspective: Feminism and the Duty to Rescue	651
2. Obligations to Rescuers	651
<i>McCoy v. American Suzuki Motor Corp.</i>	651
<i>Moody v. Delta Western, Inc.</i>	654
Statute: Professional Rescuers' Cause of Action	656
3. Protecting Third Parties from Criminal Attacks or Disease	657
<i>Emerich v. Philadelphia Center for Human Development, Inc.</i>	657
Perspective: Reliability of Predictions of Dangerousness	663
<i>Bradshaw v. Daniel</i>	664
C. Duty Limited by Type of Harm	667
1. Negligently Inflicted Emotional Distress	668
<i>Robb v. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.</i>	668
<i>James v. Lieb</i>	673
Perspective: Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	680
<i>Grotts v. Zahner</i>	680
<i>Rabideau v. City of Racine</i>	683
Perspective: Contractual Basis for Negligent Infliction Claims	686
2. Pure Economic Harm: The Economic Loss Rule	687
<i>Plourde Sand & Gravel v. JGI Eastern, Inc.</i>	688
<i>532 Madison Avenue Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Finlandia Center, Inc.</i>	694
3. "Wrongful Pregnancy," "Wrongful Birth," and "Wrongful Life"	700
<i>Greco v. United States</i>	700
Statute: Wrongful Birth Claims, Wrongful Life	706

<i>Statute: Wrongful Birth; Wrongful Life</i>	706
Perspective: Wrongful Life and Birth and Defensive Medicine	707
D. Primary Assumption of Risk	708
<i>Clower v. Snowbird Ski Resort</i>	708
<i>Statute: Acceptance of Inherent Risks</i>	714
<i>Statute: Skiers' and Tramway Passengers' Responsibilities</i>	714
<i>Statute: Duties and Responsibilities of Each Skier</i>	715
<i>Statute: Legislative Purpose</i>	715
<i>Statute: Sport Shooting Participants, Acceptance of Obvious and Inherent Risks</i>	715
<i>Edward C. v. City of Albuquerque</i>	716
<i>Statute: Colorado Baseball Spectator Safety Act</i>	721
<i>Statute: Limited Liability for Baseball Facilities</i>	722
Perspective: Utility of Primary Assumption of Risk Doctrine	723
12. DAMAGES	725
A. Introduction	725
B. Compensatory Damages	725
1. Introduction	725
<i>Gunn v. Robertson</i>	726
<i>Statute: Remittitur or Additur as Alternative to New Trial; Reformation of Verdict</i>	730
Perspective: Contract and Tort Damages	731
<i>Jordan v. Baptist Three Rivers Hospital</i>	731
<i>Statute: Wrongful Death; Damages</i>	735
<i>Statute: Survival of Actions; Death of Party</i>	735
<i>Statute: Action for Wrongful Death</i>	736
2. General Damages	737
a. In General	737
b. Pain and Suffering	737
<i>Rael v. F & S Co.</i>	737
<i>Giant Food Inc. v. Satterfield</i>	740
c. Hedonic Damages	744
<i>Loth v. Truck-A-Way Corp.</i>	745
Perspective: Hedonic Damages	751
3. Special Damages	751
<i>Moody v. Blanchard Place Apartments</i>	752
<i>Kaczowski v. Bolubasz</i>	756
C. Punitive Damages	764
<i>Peete v. Blackwell</i>	764
<i>Shugar v. Guill</i>	766

<i>State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell</i>	769
Perspective: Punitive Damages	778
D. Adjustments to Damages: Collateral Sources and Statutory Ceilings	778
<i>Perreira v. Rediger</i>	779
<i>Statute: Modified Collateral Source Rule</i>	783
<i>Etheridge v. Medical Center Hospitals</i>	784
<i>Knowles v. United States</i>	787
13. TRADITIONAL STRICT LIABILITY	793
A. Introduction	793
B. Injuries Caused by Animals	793
<i>Clark v. Brings</i>	794
<i>Statute: Harboring a Dog</i>	799
Perspective: Rationale for Strict Liability	799
<i>Byram v. Main</i>	800
<i>Statute: Trespass on Cultivated Land</i>	803
<i>Statute: Recovery for Damage to Unfenced Lands; Exception</i>	803
<i>Statute: [No-Fence District] Formation</i>	803
C. Selected Dangerous Activities	804
<i>Clark-Aiken Co. v. Cromwell-Wright Co.</i>	804
<i>Statute: Strict Liability for [Oil] Containment, Cleanup and Removal Costs</i>	809
Perspective: Strict Liability for Non-Reciprocal Risks	809
<i>Klein v. Pyrodyne Corp.</i>	810
<i>Ely v. Cabot Oil & Gas Corp.</i>	814
Perspective: Strict Liability Where Negligence Theories Fail	823
14. PRODUCTS LIABILITY	825
A. Introduction	825
B. Allowing “Strangers” to Recover for Negligence: Abrogation of the Privity Requirement	825
<i>MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.</i>	826
C. Allowing Recovery Without Proof of Negligence: Development of Strict Liability	830
1. Early Development	830
<i>Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno</i>	830
<i>Statute: Definition of Consumer</i>	835

	<i>Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.</i>	835
	Perspective: Total Occurrence of Injuries	839
2.	Restatements (Second) and (Third)	840
	<i>Restatement of Torts (Second)</i>	840
	<i>Restatement of Torts (Third): Products Liability</i>	841
	<i>Statute: Definition of Product Seller</i>	842
3.	Manufacturing Defects	843
	<i>In re Coordinated Latex Glove Litigation</i>	843
	<i>Myrlak v. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey</i>	848
4.	Design Defects	852
a.	Consumer Expectation and Risk-Utility Tests	852
	<i>Malcolm v. Evenflo Co.</i>	852
	<i>Morton v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.</i>	855
	Perspective: Expectations About What?	859
	<i>Warner Fruehauf Trailer Co. v. Boston</i>	859
	Perspective: Risk Spreading	864
	<i>Denny v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	866
b.	Mandatory Proof of a Feasible Alternative Design	871
	<i>General Motors Corp. v. Sanchez</i>	871
	<i>Statute: Product Liability Actions</i>	875
	<i>Statute: State of the Art</i>	876
	Perspective: Choosing Among Tests for Product Defect	876
5.	Warnings and Instructions	877
	<i>Richter v. Limax International</i>	878
6.	The “Comment k” Exception for Drugs	883
	<i>Freeman v. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.</i>	884
7.	The Learned Intermediary Doctrine	888
	<i>Centocor, Inc. v. Bullen</i>	888
8.	Liability of an Online Marketplace for Third-Party Sales of Defective Products	894
	<i>Bolger v. Amazon.com, LLC</i>	895
	<i>Indiana Farm Bureau Insurance v. Shenzhen Anet Technology Co., Ltd.</i>	899
9.	Plaintiff’s Carelessness or Misuse of Product	903
	<i>Smith v. Ingersoll-Rand Co.</i>	903
	<i>Daniell v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	907
	Perspective: Best Risk Avoiders	909
	<i>Trull v. Volkswagen of America, Inc.</i>	910
	<i>Hernandez v. Tokai Corp.</i>	913
10.	Compliance with Statutes and Regulations	916
	<i>Pliva, Inc. v. Mensing</i>	916
	Perspective: Uniformity Versus Variety and Innovation	921
	<i>Statute: Compliance as Evidence</i>	921
	<i>Statute: Government Rules Defense</i>	921
	<i>Statute: Presumption for Compliance</i>	922

15. TRESPASS AND NUISANCE	923
A. Trespass	923
1. Trespass to Land	923
<i>Thomas v. Harrah's Vicksburg Corp.</i>	924
<i>Baker v. Shymkiv</i>	926
Perspective: Historical Foundation for Trespass	930
2. Trespass to Chattel and Conversion	931
<i>Koepnick v. Sears Roebuck & Co.</i>	931
<i>United States v. Arora</i>	934
3. Privileges: Private and Public Necessity	938
<i>Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co.</i>	939
<i>Marty v. State of Idaho</i>	941
Perspective: Property and Liability Rules	946
Perspective: Moral View of the Necessity Defense	947
B. Nuisance	948
<i>Pestey v. Cushman</i>	948
<i>Armory Park Neighborhood Association v. Episcopal Community Services in Arizona</i>	951
<i>Statute: Nuisance Defined; Action for Abatement and Damages; Exceptions</i>	957
<i>Statute: Prostitution Houses Deemed Public Nuisances</i>	958
<i>Statute: Smoking Prohibited in Municipal Buildings</i>	958
<i>Statute: Drug Paraphernalia Control Act</i>	958
C. Comparing Trespass and Nuisance	959
1. Introduction	959
<i>Oluf Johnson v. Paynesville Farmers Union Cooperative Oil Company</i>	960
D. Remedies	966
<i>Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co.</i>	966
<i>Spur Industries v. Del E. Webb Development Co.</i>	971
Perspective: Encouraging Valuable Land Use	977
16. ALTERNATIVES TO LITIGATION	979
A. Introduction	979
B. Replacing Litigation with Insurance Systems	979
1. In General	979
2. Workers' Compensation	979
<i>Fryer v. Kranz</i>	980
<i>Cunningham v. Shelton Security Service, Inc.</i>	985
<i>Statute: Schedule in Case of Disability</i>	990
Perspective: Reforming Workers' Compensation	991

3. No-Fault Automobile Insurance	992
<i>State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Peiffer</i>	993
<i>Oberly v. Bangs Ambulance, Inc.</i>	996
<i>Weber v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.</i>	998
Perspective: Applying No-Fault Concepts to Medical Injuries	1003
4. Statutory Responses to Specific Rare Injuries	1004
<i>Schafer v. American Cyanamid Co.</i>	1004
<i>September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001</i>	1008
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>1011</i>
<i>Table of Statutes and Other Authorities</i>	<i>1023</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>1033</i>