

Subsection 10 of §26-41-03, N.D.C.C., defines the term “occupying” as follows:

26-41-03. Definitions.— As used in this chapter, the following definitions shall apply:

10. “Occupying” means to be in or upon a motor vehicle or engaged in the immediate act of entering into or alighting from the motor vehicle.

Although the legislature may not have contemplated this particular type of accident, a fair reading of the terms used would indicate that they would have provided for coverage had they considered it. This position is supported by §26-41-03(11), N.D.C.C., which defines the operation of a motor vehicle as follows:

11. “Operation of a motor vehicle” means operation, maintenance, or use of a motor vehicle as a vehicle. Operation of a motor vehicle does not include conduct within the course of a business of repairing, servicing, or otherwise maintaining motor vehicles unless the injury occurs off the business premises, or conduct in the course of loading and unloading the vehicle unless the injury occurs *while occupying it*. [Emphasis added.]

Section 26-41-03 excludes from coverage persons servicing or repairing a vehicle when in the course of business. The obvious reason for that exclusion is that a person injured in the course of the business of servicing a vehicle would be protected by the workmen’s compensation laws. This is consistent with the purpose in making no-fault insurance mandatory: namely, expanding the umbrella of insurance coverage to protect a wider group of people. . . .

The legislature expressly excluded certain persons from coverage in §26-41-08, N.D.C.C., which provides:

Persons not entitled to benefits.— Basic or optional excess no-fault benefits shall not be payable to or on behalf of any person while:

1. Occupying any motor vehicle without the expressed or implied consent of the owner or while not in lawful possession of the motor vehicle.
2. Occupying a motor vehicle owned by such person which is not insured for the benefits required by this chapter unless uninsured solely because the insurance company of such owner has not filed a form pursuant to subsection 2 of section 26-41-05 to provide the basic no-fault benefits required by this chapter.
3. In the course of a racing or speed contest, or in practice or preparation thereof.
4. Intentionally causing or attempting to cause injury to himself or another person.

Nothing in §26-41-08, N.D.C.C., indicates a legislative intent to exclude from coverage a person occupying his own car who is injured in a hunting accident.

In Paragraph XI of the findings of fact, the trial court noted that the State of North Dakota issues in excess of 102,000 general hunting licenses yearly, and in excess of 40,000 deer licenses on an annual basis. Section 20.1-01-05, N.D.C.C., makes it unlawful to carry any firearm with a cartridge in its chamber while in or on a motor vehicle. Because it is required by law and also constitutes safe hunting procedure, the acts of loading a gun when alighting from a car and unloading a gun before entering a car are common practices in North Dakota. It is foreseeable that accidents like the one in the instant case will happen and the Auto Accident Reparations Act should provide coverage absent an expressed legislative declaration to the contrary. It appears that the

legislature took special care in using the term “occupying a motor vehicle” in enacting Chapter 26-41, N.D.C.C., and the plain meaning of that term indicates that coverage exists in this case.

Judgment affirmed.

NOTES TO STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE CO. v. PEIFFER, OBERLY v. BANGS AMBULANCE, INC., AND WEBER v. STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE CO.

1. Goals and Purposes of Automobile No-Fault Insurance System. Workers compensation systems and automobile no-fault systems provide benefits without regard to fault and preclude access to the ordinary tort system. The cases in this chapter all refer to the legislative purposes for the two systems. Are the legislative goals the same? Do differences in the purposes explain any differences in the operation of the systems?

2. Limits on the No-Fault System. The New York statute discussed in *Oberly v. Bangs Ambulance, Inc.* allows a victim access to the traditional tort system if the victim suffers: (1) “significant disfigurement,” (2) “permanent loss of use of a body organ, member, function or system,” (3) “permanent consequential limitation of use of a body organ or member,” or (4) “significant limitation of use of a body function or system.” Prior to *Oberly*, New York decisions had made it clear that an injury had to cause a significant harm to be characterized as significant disfigurement, permanent consequential limitation of use, or significant limitation of use of a body function or system. That background would explain why the plaintiff, who suffered only bruising, cramping, and pain, responded to the defendant’s summary judgment motion by abandoning all of the serious injury standards except for the “permanent loss of use of a body organ, member, function or system” standard.

How does narrowing the application of clauses like the one interpreted in *Oberly* further or thwart the primary purposes of establishing a no-fault system for automobile-related injuries?

3. Scope of the No-Fault System. The causal connection test described in *Weber v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.* limits the range of accidents to which the automobile no-fault system applies. The North Dakota statute supplies language defining what accidents will be included. What statutory language and what evidence supported the court’s conclusion that the injury should be covered by the no-fault system? If the plaintiff had injured himself with a knife while trying to have a snack in the passenger seat of the automobile, would the no-fault system provide for compensation?

4. Attention to Statutory Language. Defining the scope of no-fault coverage requires careful attention to the statutes requiring that coverage. For example, Colorado’s statute requires insurance companies to cover certain relatives of the insured when they are “injured in an accident involving any motor vehicle” but does not require coverage for motorcycles. In a case where the plaintiff was injured when he rode a motorcycle and collided with a truck, the Colorado Supreme Court held that because the accident involved a motor vehicle (the truck), provisions of an insurance policy that purported to deny coverage violated the statute. See *DeHerrera v. Sentry Insurance Co.*, 30 P.3d 167 (Colo. 2001).

Perspective: Applying No-Fault Concepts to Medical Injuries

Proposals to treat medical injuries in a no-fault framework are necessarily complex. Responding to a study that showed most medical injuries in hospitals are related to failures to observe and learn from errors and to emphasis on individual conduct rather than systemic causes of error, David M. Studdert and Troyen A. Brennan have made the following suggestions in *Toward a Workable Model of "No-Fault" Compensation for Medical Injury in the United States*, 27 Am. J.L. & Med. 225 (2001):

To be successful in the current environment . . . the push to gather more detailed information on errors and their causes must contend with practitioners' wariness of reporting events that may leave them open to accusations of negligence. Both anecdotal and empirical evidence suggest that providers are less willing to disclose information about errors they make or see when a punitive atmosphere prevails. Fear of blame among those individuals closest to errors thus poses a major obstacle to design and implementation of patient safety initiatives. This cost, together with ongoing concerns about the performance of the medical malpractice system, underscore the need to consider alternative systems that are better able to compensate injured patients and promote high quality healthcare. . . .

The major alternative to the current tort system is the no-fault model. . . . In the medical arena, various forms of no-fault are firmly established in health care systems abroad: New Zealand and Sweden have operated no-fault systems for compensating medical injury for more than 25 years, and Finland, Denmark and Norway for more than a decade. Several small medical no-fault schemes have also been implemented in the United States to compensate specific injury types, including the Florida and Virginia schemes for birth-related neurological injury and the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. . . .

Workable compensation criteria are fundamental to any no-fault scheme. Adverse events occur in approximately three to five percent of hospitalizations; the budget for compensating every one would be prohibitive. In any system some uninsured costs will inevitably rebound to the injured patient. But whereas tort systems seek to confine compensation to events in which negligence caused injury, no-fault schemes offer compensation to a wider class of events. In the considerable terrain of medical injury types that lies between all adverse events and only negligent ones, the threshold for compensation in foreign no-fault systems varies.

We believe that the Swedish example of basing eligibility for compensation on the avoidability of the event is the most rational basis to compensate, and also the one that best facilitates quality improvement in medicine. While "avoidability" is a subjective determination like negligence, the Swedish experience suggests that their decision-making processes have been successful in applying it to separate eligible claims from ineligible ones. With the benefit of many years of experience, the Swedes are able to identify many types of claims that should reasonably be compensated on the strength of basic information about the circumstances of the incident and the nature of the disability suffered.

D. Statutory Responses to Specific Rare Injuries

A federal statute provides compensation to victims of injuries caused by certain vaccines. Money for the compensation comes from a tax on vaccines, and the statute establishes methods that are intended to allow for quick and easy adjudication of claims. A person who accepts an award under this statute is barred from seeking damages in the ordinary tort system. Another federal statute provides compensation to victims of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Awards under that statute are funded by general revenues rather than a specific tax. *Schafer v. American Cyanamid Co.* describes many of the important aspects of the vaccine statute in the context of a dispute about whether a loss of consortium suit may be brought under ordinary tort principles when the primary victim of a vaccine-related injury has accepted compensation under the act. The September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 statute shows how principles related to those applied in the vaccine statute and also in workers' compensation cases were adapted to the context of providing compensation to victims of terrorism.

SCHAFFER v. AMERICAN CYANAMID CO.

20 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1994)

BREYER, C.J.

The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, 42 U.S.C. §§300aa-1 to 300aa-34, provides a special procedure to compensate those who are injured by certain vaccines. The Act bars those who accept an award under that procedure from later bringing a tort suit to obtain additional compensation. The question before us in this appeal . . . is whether the Act also bars the family of such a person from bringing a tort suit to obtain compensation for their own, related, injuries, in particular, for loss of companionship or consortium. Assuming that state law permits such suits, we find nothing in the Act that explicitly or implicitly bars them. And, we affirm the similar determination of the district court.

The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act represents an effort to provide compensation to those harmed by childhood vaccines outside the framework of traditional tort law. Congress passed the law after hearing testimony 1) describing the critical need for vaccines to protect children from disease, 2) pointing out that vaccines inevitably harm a very small number of the many millions of people who are vaccinated, and 3) expressing dissatisfaction with traditional tort law as a way of compensating those few victims. Injured persons (potential tort plaintiffs) complained about the tort law system's uncertain recoveries, the high cost of litigation, and delays in obtaining compensation. They argued that government had, for all practical purposes, made vaccination obligatory, and thus it had a responsibility to ensure that those injured by vaccines were compensated. Vaccine manufacturers (potential tort defendants) complained about litigation expenses and occasional large recoveries, which caused insurance premiums and vaccine prices to rise, and which ultimately threatened the stability of the vaccine supply.

The Vaccine Act responds to these complaints by creating a remedial system that tries more quickly to deliver compensation to victims, while also reducing insurance and litigation costs for manufacturers. The Act establishes a special claims procedure

involving the Court of Federal Claims and special masters (a system that we shall call the "Vaccine Court"). A person injured by a vaccine may file a petition with the Vaccine Court to obtain compensation (from a fund financed by a tax on vaccines). He need not prove fault. Nor, to prove causation, need he show more than that he received the vaccine and then suffered certain symptoms within a defined period of time. The Act specifies amounts of compensation for certain kinds of harm (e.g., \$250,000 for death, up to \$250,000 for pain and suffering). And, it specifies other types of harm for which compensation may be awarded (e.g., medical expenses, loss of earnings).

At the same time, the Act modifies, but does not eliminate, the traditional tort system, which Congress understood to provide important incentives for the safe manufacture and distribution of vaccines. The Act requires that a person injured directly by a vaccine first bring a Vaccine Court proceeding. Then, it gives that person the choice either to accept the Court's award and abandon his tort rights (which the Act transfers to the federal government), or to reject the judgment and retain his tort rights. He can also keep his tort rights by withdrawing his Vaccine Court petition if the Court moves too slowly.

The Act additionally helps manufacturers by providing certain federal modifications of state tort law. For example, it forbids the award of compensation for injuries that flow from "unavoidable side effects"; it frees the manufacturer from liability for not providing direct warnings to an injured person (or his representative); it imposes a presumption that compliance with Food and Drug Administration requirements means the manufacturer provided proper directions and warnings; it limits punitive damage awards; and it requires that the trial of any tort suit take place in three phases (liability; general damages; punitive damages).

The upshot is a new remedial system that interacts in a complicated way with traditional tort lawsuits.

For present purposes, the relevant facts are simple. Lenita Schafer's small child, Melissa Schafer, received an oral polio vaccine distributed by American Cyanamid in October 1988. Lenita subsequently contracted polio (she and her family think) from Melissa's vaccine. About one year later, in December 1989, all three members of the Schafer family (Lenita, Melissa, and Lenita's husband, Mark) petitioned the Vaccine Court for compensation. In April 1990, Mark and Melissa withdrew their petitions (with permission of the Vaccine Court) and began this lawsuit against American Cyanamid, seeking damages under Massachusetts tort law for loss of Lenita's companionship and consortium. Lenita, who did not withdraw her petition, eventually accepted a \$750,000 award from the Vaccine Court for her own injuries, thereby giving up her right to bring a tort action. At that point, American Cyanamid asked the district court to dismiss Mark's and Melissa's suit on the ground that Lenita's acceptance of the Vaccine Court award barred not only a later tort action for her own injuries, but also a later tort action by family members for related injuries. The district court denied the motion. We review that denial. . . .

Cyanamid concedes that this case focuses upon Mark's and Melissa's damages, not Lenita's; that Lenita received Vaccine Court compensation for her own damages, not Mark's or Melissa's; and that the Act's language explicitly bars Lenita, but not Mark or Melissa, from bringing a tort action to recover their own damages (which, we specify, will not duplicate Lenita's). Nonetheless, it argues that to permit Mark or Melissa to bring their own tort action (for related damages) would so seriously interfere with the

Act's basic purposes that we must read the Act as implicitly barring those actions, just as it explicitly bars Lenita's. [The argument] has two essential elements—an important federal purpose and a significant state interference. And, we shall try to set forth these two elements of Cyanamid's argument in light of the Act's legislative history, and as persuasively as possible.

First, an important federal purpose of the Act is to free manufacturers from the specter of large, uncertain tort liability, and thereby keep vaccine prices fairly low and keep manufacturers in the market. . . .

Evidence in the hearing record indicated that compensation-related price increases or manufacturer withdrawal would cause serious harm. Vaccines benefit those who are vaccinated, and they have public benefits as well—when parents vaccinate their own children, they also help stop the spread of a disease that can injure others. And, even though vaccines themselves cause a small number of serious injuries or deaths, their widespread use dramatically reduces fatalities. . . .

The upshot is that, because vaccines benefit so many (and harm so few), even small vaccine price increases, if followed by even a small decline in vaccinations, can cause more public harm through added disease than the sum-total of all the harm vaccines themselves cause through side-effects. For this kind of reason, the argument goes, Congress was importantly motivated not only by the desire effectively to compensate side-effect victims, but also by the desire to keep vaccine prices fairly low by reducing compensation costs. . . .

Second, the availability of a state tort remedy for relatives of a victim interferes with the Act's efforts to lower manufacturers' costs. The Act seeks to achieve its cost-reducing purpose, not by denying compensation to victims (indeed, it imposes a tax upon vaccines in order to fund compensation), but by reducing the litigation and insurance costs related to lengthy, complex tort procedures and random large tort awards. . . .

But, Cyanamid points out, almost every victim has a family. And, almost every vaccine-related injury to a child will adversely affect the life of that family. In Cyanamid's view, if family members can bring a tort suit for loss of say, a child's companionship, even after the child accepts a Vaccine Court award, they will do so.

Cyanamid then says (and this is the most difficult part of Cyanamid's argument) that to permit a victim's family to bring a tort law case—even where the victim obtains a Vaccine Court award—threatens seriously to undermine the Act's "cost-related" advantages. The result will be a system in which manufacturers must pay both the Vaccine Court's easily-obtained compensation awards (through a tax) and also face large tort claims from family members. The latter means the very kind of large occasional tort awards and the kind of litigation costs that Congress hoped to diminish. Cyanamid concludes that the Act implicitly must hold family members to the election of the physically-injured victim. If that victim receives an award and can no longer pursue a court claim, then neither can the victim's family. . . .

Cyanamid's argument is not without force, but ultimately it does not persuade us, either as a matter of statutory interpretation or in terms of pre-emption law. First, one cannot easily interpret the statute as Cyanamid wishes, for the Act has no language at all that one might read as creating a bar to the type of suit before us. To the contrary, the Act subsection that creates the tort action bar says that it does not apply to this kind of lawsuit. The language that creates the bar, §300aa-11(a), says: "no person may bring a civil action for damages" (except in accordance with the

Act's Vaccine-Court-related rules) until a Vaccine Court petition "has been filed." It then states specifically that "this subsection" (i.e. the subsection with the tort action bar):

applies only to a person who has sustained a vaccine-related injury or death and who is qualified to file a petition for compensation under the Program.

42 U.S.C. §300aa-11(a)(9)

Second, the Act's legislative history does not point directly toward the "policy" conclusion that Cyanamid wishes us to draw. The legislative history says nothing at all about family members' tort suits. Its discussion of general purposes, as we have pointed out above . . . indicates two major purposes, namely, providing compensation for victims and maintaining low vaccine costs. How does Cyanamid's argument take account of the "victim compensation" objective? Because the Vaccine Court does not provide a remedy for family members, to accept Cyanamid's argument would require us to conclude that Congress, without anyone saying a word about it, intended to deprive family members of all compensatory remedies. At the same time, the second leg of Cyanamid's argument — the claim that permitting this kind of suit would significantly interfere with Congress's cost control objective — has no specific empirical support in the legislative record; and, the claim does not prove itself. . . .

Third, to accept Cyanamid's argument — that the Schafer family cannot collect both a Vaccine Court award and loss of consortium tort damages — would create judicial inconsistency. The Vaccine Court has held that a parent can both obtain a loss of consortium "award" from a state court (or the settlement of a state law claim) and also obtain compensation for her vaccinated (and injured) child from the Vaccine Court. The Vaccine Court cases all involve families that brought the tort suit first, before the child accepted Vaccine Court compensation. But, it is difficult to find any policy that would justify permitting a family to bring a suit before the Vaccine Court awards compensation to a direct victim, but not after.

. . . Cyanamid's arguments are better made to Congress than to this court. We agree with the district court that the Act, as currently written, does not bar the suit before us. . . . And, its order refusing to dismiss the case, therefore, is Affirmed.

NOTES TO SCHAFER v. AMERICAN CYANAMID CO.

1. Limitations on Tort Suits. The Vaccine Injury Act discourages use of the traditional tort system in two main ways: by offering compensation in exchange for a victim's right to bring a suit and by changing the rules that would apply in a suit if a victim did decide to litigate. What limitations on tort suits does the act impose, and how do the limitations alter typical state rules for products liability cases?

2. Causation. The statute establishes two methods for showing that a victim's injury was caused by a vaccine. Causation is treated as established if the facts of a victim's case fit the parameters in a Vaccine Injury Table adopted as part of the statute and supplemented later by administrative regulations. The Table lists types of vaccines, types of reactions, and time periods within which those reactions must occur in order for causation to be established. The other method allowed under the statute is the "non-Table" method, under which a victim may introduce evidence to show that a vaccine did cause an injury even though the injury was not manifested within the time periods specified in the Table.

In a case where a victim's death was shown to have been caused both by a vaccine and by a different medical condition unrelated to the vaccine, a court has held that a vaccination is a legal cause of a harm if it is a substantial factor in bringing about the harm and is also a but-for cause of the harm. The court adopted causation principles from the Restatement (Second) of Torts. See *Shyface v. Secretary of Health & Human Services*, 165 F.3d 1344 (4th Cir. 1999).

SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND OF 2001

Pub. L. No. 107-42 (Sept. 22, 2001)

SEC. 403. PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this title to provide compensation to any individual (or relatives of a deceased individual) who was physically injured or killed as a result of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001.

SEC. 404. ADMINISTRATION

(a) In general.—The Attorney General, acting through a Special Master appointed by the Attorney General, shall—

(1) administer the compensation program established under this title[.]

SEC. 405. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPENSATION

(a) Filing of claim.—

(1) In general.—A claimant may file a claim for compensation under this title with the Special Master. The claim shall be on the form developed under paragraph (2) and shall state the factual basis for eligibility for compensation and the amount of compensation sought.

(b) Review and Determination[.]

(1) Review.—The Special Master shall review a claim submitted under subsection (a) and determine—

(A) whether the claimant is an eligible individual under subsection (c);

(B) With respect to a claimant determined to be an eligible individual—

(i) the extent of the harm to the claimant, including any economic and noneconomic losses; and

(ii) the amount of compensation to which the claimant is entitled based on the harm to the claimant, the facts of the claim, and the individual circumstances of the claimant.

(2) Negligence.—With respect to a claimant, the Special Master shall not consider negligence or any other theory of liability.

(c) Eligibility.—

(1) In general.—A claimant shall be determined to be an eligible individual for purposes of this subsection if the Special Master determines that such claimant—

(A) is an individual described in paragraph (2); and

(B) meets the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) Individuals. — A claimant is an individual described in this paragraph if the claimant is —

(A) An individual who —

(i) was present at the World Trade Center, (New York, New York), the Pentagon (Arlington, Virginia), or the site of the aircraft crash at Shanksville, Pennsylvania at the time, or in the immediate aftermath, of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001; and

(ii) suffered physical harm or death as a result of such an air crash;

(B) an individual who was a member of the flight crew or a passenger on American Airlines flight 11 or 77 or United Airlines flight 93 or 175, except that an individual identified by the Attorney General to have been a participant or conspirator in the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001, or a representative of such individual shall not be eligible to receive compensation under this title; or

(C) in the case of a decedent who is an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the personal representative of the decedent who files a claim on behalf of the decedent. . . .

(3) Requirements. —

(A) Single claim. — Not more than one claim may be submitted under this title by an individual or on behalf of a deceased individual.

(B) Limitation on civil action. —

(i) In general. — Upon the submission of a claim under this title, the claimant waives the right to file a civil action (or to be a party to an action) in any Federal or State court for damages sustained as a result of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001. The preceding sentence does not apply to a civil action to recover collateral source obligations, or to a civil action against any person who is a knowing participant in any conspiracy to hijack any aircraft or commit any terrorist act.

(ii) Pending actions. — In the case of an individual who is a party to a civil action described in clause (i), such individual may not submit a claim under this title unless such individual withdraws from such action by the date that is 90 days after the date on which regulations are promulgated under section 407.

NOTES TO SEPTEMBER 11TH VICTIM COMPENSATION FUND STATUTE

1. Elements of Compensation Fund Statutes. Compensation fund statutes define those eligible for compensation, typically require recipients to forgo compensation that might otherwise have been available, and establish procedures for making awards. How does the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Statute treat each of these elements?

2. Findings of Fact. The statute requires determinations of (1) whether an individual was injured in one of the terrorist-related air crashes, and (2) what economic and non-economic losses that injury caused. The first of these determinations is likely to be straightforward. What complications might be related to the second determination?

(1) Individual — A person is an individual described in this section if

the person is —

(A) an individual who

(i) was present at the World Trade Center (New York, New York) on September 11, 2001, on the site of the aircraft crash, or a contractor, subcontractor or the family or an immediate family member of the person related to the crash, or September 11, 2001; and

(ii) suffered physical harm or death as a result of an aircraft crash, or an individual who was a member of the flight crew or a passenger on a foreign aircraft flight on or after September 11, 2001, or a participant, contractor in the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001, or a representative of such individual who is eligible to receive compensation under this title or

(B) in the case of a decedent who is an individual described in sub-paragraph (A) or (D), the personal representative of the decedent who files a claim on behalf of the decedent.

(2) Representative —

(A) A claim that one claim may be admitted under this title in individual or on behalf of a deceased individual.

(B) Limitation on civil action —

(1) In general — Upon the satisfaction of a claim under this title, the claimant waives the right to file a civil action (or to be a party to an action) in any Federal or State court for damages sustained as a result of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001. The preceding sentence does not apply to a civil action to recover collateral source obligations or to a civil action against any person who is a knowing participant in any conspiracy to obstruct any claim or court, any tortious act.

(2) Pending actions — In the case of an individual who is a party to a civil action described in clause (1), such individual may not assert a claim under this title unless such right is established with respect to such action by the date that is 90 days after the date on which regulations are promulgated under section 107.

NOTES TO THE REPEALER OF THE VICTIM COMPENSATION REPEAL STATUTE

1. Elements of Compensation from Statute — Compensation from statute defines those eligible for compensation, typically recipients to foreign compensation that might otherwise have been available, and readily accessible for making awards. However, the definition of the Victim Compensation Fund Statute was each of these elements.

2. Elements of Tort — The statute requires descriptions of (1) whether an individual was injured in one of the terrorist-related crashes and (2) what non-tortious and non-economic loss that injury caused. The list of these descriptions is likely to be significant. What compensation might be related to the event determination.

TABLE OF CASES

Italic type indicates principal cases.

- Abrams v. United States, 791
Adams v. Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., 735
Aebischer v. Reidt, 191
Agriss v. Roadway Express, Inc., 778, 781
Aiken v. Holyoke St. Ry., 130n
Ainsworth v. Lakin, 645
Albert v. Shultz, 210, 213
Alfonso v. Piccadilly Cafeteria, 575
Algie v. Algie, 353
Allied Chem. Corp. v. Wells, 839
Alteiri v. Colasso, 20, 47
Alvarez v. New Haven Register Inc., 402
Alvis v. Ribar, 313
Amabile v. Auto Kleen Car Wash, 287
America East India Corp. v. Ideal Shoe Co.,
741
*American Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Thorne
Equipment Company*, 264
Anderson v. Bushong Pontiac Co., 282
Anderson v. Nebraska Dept. of Social
Services, 594
Anderson v. Stream, 355
Andover Newton Theological Sch., Inc. v.
Continental Casualty Co., 129
Andrepoint v. Naquin, 56
Andrews v. Peters, 28, 29, 36
Andrulonis v. United States, 347
Anjou v. Boston Elevated Railway Co., 478
Anton v. Industrial Commission, 408
Arauz v. Gerhardt, 536
Archibald v. Braverman, 536
*Armory Park Neighborhood Association v.
Episcopal Community Services in Arizona*,
751, 754
Armstrong v. Paoli Memorial Hospital, 537
Arneson v. Olsen, 627, 628
Ayers v. Robinson, 594

Bacon v. Sevier County, 839
Baggett v. Industrial Commission, 840
Bahura v. S.E.W. Investors, 271
Bailey v. Binyon, 84
Baines v. Collins, 130n
Baker v. Fabian, Thielen & Thielen, 456
Baker v. Shymkiv, 729, 732, 760
Bale v. Perryman, 150
Ballard v. Uribe, 229
Barefoot v. Estelle, 524
Barker v. Lull Engineering Co., 672, 679
Barranco v. Jackson, 354, 358
Barton v. Adams Rental, Inc., 393
Battocchi v. Washington Hospital Center,
200
Beagle v. Vasold, 588
Beaulieu v. Elliott, 602
Beck v. FMC Corp., 546
Becker v. Schwartz, 554
Behrens v. Bertram Mills Circus, Ltd., 637
Bennett, Admr. v. Stanley, 462
Berkovitz v. United States, 345
Bernier v. Upjohn, Co., 360

- Beshada v. John-Manville Products Corp., 685
 Beverly Enterprises-Virginia v. Nichols, 437
 Bhinder v. Sun Co., 393
 Bier v. Leanna Lakeside Property Association, 145
Black v. Abex Corp., 201, 208
 Blake v. Cruz, 556
 Blankenship v. Wagner, 168
 Bluejacket v. Carney, 481
 Blyth v. Birmingham Water Works, 95
 BMW of North America v. Gore, 612, 613, 616, 617
 B.N. v. K.K., 240
 Bodeine v. Enterprise High Sch., 5n
 Boggs v. Blue Diamond Coal Co., 832
 Boody v. United States, 215
Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co., 761, 762
Boone v. Boone, 352, 358
Borders v. Roseberry, 488
 Boroughs v. Joiner, 411
 Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc., 803, 820
 Bowen v. Eli Lilly & Co., 360
 Bowen v. Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co., 541
 Boyd v. United States, 735
 Bozza v. Vornado, Inc., 476
 Braddock v. Seaboard Air Line Railroad Company, 586
 Bradley v. Appalachian Power Co., 374
Bradshaw v. Daniel, 519, 525
 Bratton v. Rudnick, 645
 Brendle v. R.R., 309
 Breunig v. American Family Insurance Co., 127
 Brian v. B. Sopkin & Sons, Inc., 645
Brisboy v. Fibreboard Paper Products Corporation, 181, 184, 186, 188
Broadwell v. Holmes, 352
 Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co., 592
 Brooks v. Dietz, 700
Brower v. Ackerly, 40, 41
 Brown v. Alliance Real Estate Group, 482
 Brown v. Keill, 389
 Brown v. Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, 270
 Brown v. San Francisco Baseball Club, 568
 Brown v. Superior Court, 204, 673
Bryam v. Main, 641
 Bryant v. Alpha Entertainment Corp., 140
 Brzoska v. Olson, 33
 Buckingham v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 659
 Burch v. University of Kansas, 492
 Burke v. 12 Rothschild's Liquor Mart. Inc., 312
 Burke v. Rivo, 557
Burke v. Schaffner, 193, 197, 199
 Burke v. United States, 600
 Burmaster v. Gravity Drainage Dist. No. 2, 364
 Burrell v. Meads, 471
 Buskirk v. Bucklew, 436
 Butaud v. Suburban Marine & Sporting Goods, Inc., 712
Byrne v. Boadle, 161, 171
 Caiazzo v. Volkswagenwerk A.G., 717
 Camina v. Parliament Ins. Co., 478
 Canterbury v. Spence, 439, 440, 441, 442
 Caraballo v. United States, 289, 347
 Carbone v. Ursich, 552
 Cardina v. Kash N'Karry Food Stores, Inc., 99, 167
 Carlisle v. J. Weingarten, Inc., 468
 Carmona v. Hagerman Irrigation Company, 465
Carter v. Chesterfield County Health Commission, 342, 349
 Carroll v. Hemenway, 130
 Case v. Fiberboard Corp., 210
 Cates v. Cates, 355, 357
Cay v. State of Louisiana, Department of Transportation and Development, 174
Cervelli v. Graves, 107
 Chaffin v. Chaffin, 357
 Chambers v. St. Mary's School, 138
 Chapadeau v. Utica Observer Dispatch, Inc., 827
 Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, 804
Chelcher v. Spider Stagina Corp., 264, 266
 Cianci v. New Times Publishing Co., 791, 792
 City of Ft. Smith v. Western Hide & Fur Co., 769
 City of Phoenix v. Johnson, 755
 City of Scottsdale v. Kokaska, 258
Clark v. Brings, 633, 634, 637
Clark-Aiken Company v. Cromwell-Wright Company, 643
 Clausen v. Carroll, 192
Clover v. Snowbird Ski Resort, 560
 Coble v. Knight, 309
 Coburn v. Burton, 500
 Cohen v. Brockton Sav. Bank, 644
 Cohen v. McDonnell Douglas Corp., 536
 Coker v. McDonald's Corp., 121

- Cole v. Turner, 37
 Coleman v. Garrison, 559
Coleman v. Hines, 308, 314
 Collins v. Eli Lilly & Co., 206
 Collins v. Otto, 637
 Colmenares Vivas v. Sun Alliance Insurance Co., 166
 CompuServe Inc. v. Cyber Promotions, Inc., 742
 Concord Florida, Inc. v. Lewin, 249
 Connick v. Myers, 826, 827
 Connors v. University Associates in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 170
 Cook, Flanagan & Berst v. Clausing, 452
 Cook v. City of Winston-Salem, 121
 Cook v. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie R. Co., 182
Cook v. Winfrey, 788, 789
 Cooper v. Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co., 410
 Cooper v. Bondoni, 190, 191
 Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Leatherman Tool Group, Inc., 612
Corbett v. Weisband, 284, 286
 Cornell v. Council of Unit Owners Hawaiian Village Condominiums, Inc., 325
 Costos v. Coconut Island Corp., 407
 Cotton v. State, 69
 Coughlan v. Grande & Son, Inc., 645
Coulthurst v. United States, 341, 344
 Cramer v. Theda Clerk Memorial Hospital, 426
Creasy v. Rusk, 123
 Crosby v. Canino, 149
 Cruz-Mendez v. ISU/Insurance Servs., 242
Cullison v. Medley, 40, 44, 45
 Cuney v. Campbell, 636
Cunningham v. Shelton Security Service, Inc., 832, 836
 Curtis Publishing Co. v. Butts, 803, 808

 Dalton v. Kalispell Regional Hospital, 437
Dana v. Oak Park Marina, Inc., 82
Daniell v. Ford Motor Co., 710, 714, 715
 Daniels v. Evans, 113
 Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 696
Davenport v. Cotton Hope Plantation Horizontal Property Regime, 326
 David Katterhenrich v. Federal Hocking Local School District Board of Education, 81
 Davis v. Knippling, 340
 Davis v. Ross, 828
 Debus v. Grand Union Stores of Vermont, 589
 Decker v. Gammon, 639, 640
 DeHerrera v. Sentry Insurance Co., 852
 Delaney v. Cade, 214
 Delaney v. Deere and Co., 702
 Dellwo v. Pearson, 113
Denny v. Ford Motor Co., 678, 687
 Depue v. Flatau, 744, 749
 Devlin v. Smith, 657, 658
 Di Giorgio v. Indiveri, 27
 Dierks v. Mitsubishi Motors Corp., 673
 Dill v. Excel Packing Company, 769
 Dillon v. Legg, 533, 534, 535, 536, 538, 552
 Dimick v. Schiedt, 627
Dobson v. Louisiana Power & Light Co., 297, 301
 Doe v. American Red Cross Blood Services, S.C. Region, 419
 Dominguez v. Equitable Life Assurance Society, 77
Dover Elevator Co. v. Swann, 160
Downing v. United Auto Racing Association, 308, 311, 314, 316
 Dranzo v. Winterhalter, 372
 Duke v. County of Pulaski, 626
 Dulieu v. White & Sons, 256, 257
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, 823, 842
 Duncan v. Hixon, 145
 Dunlop Tire and Rubber Corp. v. FMC, 546
 Dunphy v. Gregor, 539
 Duphily v. Delaware Elec. Co-op., Inc., 283
Dykema v. Gus Macker Enterprises, Inc., 228, 229

 Earl v. Bouchard Transp. Co. Inc., 599
 Earl v. Van Alstine, 635
 Eastman v. Scott, 636
 Eddy v. McAninch, 151
Edwards v. Basel Pharmaceuticals, 703, 707
Eisel v. Board of Education of Montgomery County, 228, 236
 Edwards v. City of Portsmouth, 350
 Eiselein v. K-Mart, Inc., 480
 Elden v. Sheldon, 539
 Elder v. Gaffney Ledger, 810
 Elias v. Youngken, 774
Elledge v. Richard/Lexington School District Five, 153, 154, 155
 Elliott v. Philadelphia Transp. Co., 314
 Ellis v. Safety Ins. Co., 796

- Elton v. Anheuser-Busch Beverage Group, Inc., 734
Emerich v. Philadelphia Center for Human Development, Inc., 519
 Emmer v. Merin, 843
 England v. S&M Foods, Inc., 22
 Enright v. Groves, 74
 Entick v. Carrington, 735
 Erickson v. Bronson, 636
 Erlandson v. Baptist Hosp., 581
 Escalante v. Koerner, 82
Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno, 659, 660, 663, 666
 Estate of Flickinger v. Ritsky, 287
Etheridge v. Medical Center Hospitals, 619, 623, 631
 Evans v. General Motors Corporation, 717
 Evridge v. American Honda Motor Co., 280
 Ewing v. Pittsburgh, etc. R. Co., 529
 Eyrich ex rel. Eyrich v. Dam, 540

 Fagin v. Kelly, 812
 Faris v. Potomac Elec. Power Co., 289
 Farley v. Meadows, 436
 Farm Bureau Ins. Group v. Phillips, 114
 Farmers Ass'n v. Fitzgerald, 151
 Fearing v. Bucher, 407
 Feldman v. Allegheny Airlines, 602, 603
 Feldman v. Lederle Laboratories, 685
 Felix v. Asai, 403n, 404, 406
 Fernanders v. Marks Constr. of S.C., Inc., 372
 Ferriter v. Daniel O'Connell's Sons, Inc., 535
 Fibre Leather Mfg. Corp. v. Ramsay Mills, Inc., 644, 645
 Field v. The Boyer Co., 390, 391
 5th Avenue Chocolatiere v. 540 Acquisition Co., 544, 545, 547
 Filburn v. People's Palace and Aquarium Co., 635
 First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 826
 Fischer v. Moore, 257
Fishman v. Brooks, 450, 453
 Fitzpatrick v. Madonna, 692
 532 Madison Avenue Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Finlandia Center, Inc., 544, 545, 547
 535 Madison Avenue Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Finlandia Center, Inc., 544
 Fletcher v. Rylands, 642-649
 Forbes & Co. v. So. Cotton Oil Co., 625
 Ford v. Jeffries, 265, 270
 Forsyth v. Palmer, 601

 Fortier v. Los Rios Community College Dist., 332
 Fournell v. Usher Pest Control Co., 533, 535
 Fowler v. Seaton, 167
 Fox v. Ford Motor Co., 718
 Franken v. Sioux City, 637
 Franklin v. Toal, 156
Freeman v. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., 703, 704
 Freeman v. United Fruit Co., 130n
Freightliner Corp. v. Myrick, 722
 Freyermuth v. Lutfy, 258
 Fryer v. Kranz, 832

 Gaetano v. Sharon Herald Co., 785
 Gail v. Clark, 517
 Gallaher v. Ricketts, 409
 Gammill v. United States, 526, 527
 Garrison v. State of Louisiana, 803, 805, 808, 826
 Gates v. Jensen, 426
 Gaw v. State of Utah, 151
 Gehres v. City of Phoenix, 378, 379
 General Elec. Co. v. Niemet, 393
General Motors Corp. v. Sanchez, 692
 Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc., 803, 812, 814, 816, 817, 819, 822, 824-826
Giant Food Inc. v. Satterfield, 584, 586
 Gibson v. Beaver, 328
 Gibson v. Gibson, 355, 358
Gifford v. National Enquirer, 778, 785
 Gilbert v. Showerman, 769
 Glanzer v. Shepard, 550
 Glomb v. Glomb, 188, 380
 Goade v. Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, 569
 Goldberg, Weprin & Ustin v. Tishman Construction, 544, 545, 547
 Golden Flake Snack Foods, Inc. v. Thornton, 140
 Goldman v. Johns-Mansville Sales Corp., 210
 Goller v. White, 355
 Gonzales v. Wilkinson, 464
 Goodfellow v. Cogburn, 113
 Gordon v. Willis Knighton Med. Ctr., 216
 Gorris v. Scott, 146
 Gould v. Taco Bell, 481, 485
 Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Melton, 413
 Graci v. Damon, 306
Graff v. Beard, 228, 233
 Graham v. Willis-Knighton Med. Ctr., 216

- Grall v. Meyer, 473
 Gray v. Morley, 45
 Gray v. Russell, 518
 Gray v. St. Martin's Press, Inc., 811
 Greco v. United States, 553
 Green v. Chicago Tribune Company, 85
 Greenbelt Coop. Publishing Assoc. v. Bresler, 789, 792
 Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc., 659, 664, 667, 668
 Gross v. Allen, 114
 Grotts v. Zahner, 528, 537
 GTE Southwest, Inc. v. Bruce, 82
 Guille v. Swan, 516
 Gunn v. Robertson, 574, 578

 H. Rosenblum, Inc. v. Adler, 549
 Hack v. Gillespie, 518
 Haimes v. Hart, 5n
 Hall v. McBryde, 46
 Hambright v. First Baptist Church, 470
 Hammond v. Colt Indus. Oper. Corp., 653
 Hammontree v. Jenner, 95
 Hanks v. Powder Ridge Restaurant Corp., 325
 Hankins v. Harvey, 140
 Hanley v. Citizens Bank of Massachusetts, 359, 360, 364
 Hansen v. Richey, 494
 Hansen v. Salt Lake County, 388
 Hardin v. Farris, 361
 Hardy v. Carmichael, 550
 Harley-Davidson Motorsports, Inc. v. Markley, 826
 Harman v. Moore's Quality Snack Foods, 838
 Harn v. Continental Lumber Co., 834
 Harrell v. City of Norfolk, 351
 Harte-Hanks Communications v. Connaughton, 820, 821
 Hartsock v. Bandhauer, 464
 Harvey v. Hansen, 287
 Hawco v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth., 130
 Hawk v. Hawk, 357
 Haynes v. Hamilton County, 276
 Hegyes v. Unjian Enterprises Inc., 228, 229
 Hein v. Merck & Co., Inc., 593
 Heino v. Harper, 357
 Helling v. Carey, 426
 Hellriegel v. Tholl, 54
 Helton v. Montgomery, Ky. App., 463
 Henderson v. Henderson, 773, 774
 Henry Clay v. Jersey City, 550
 Herb v. Hollowell, 585
 Hernandez v. Tokai Corp., 711; 719
 Hewellette v. George, 355
 Hickory Transfer Co. v. Nezbed, 167
 Hillerby v. Town of Colchester, 352
 Hines v. Pollock, 122
 Hodges v. Jewel Cos., 122
 Hodges v. Oklahoma Journal Publishing Co., 809
 Hodges v. Walsh, 748
 Hoem v. State, 629
 Hofer v. Meyer, 464, 465
 Hoffman v. Planters Gin Co., 470
 Hofmann v. Blackmon, 526
 Hogan v. Tavzel, 49, 52
 Holodook v. Spencer, 356, 358
 Holzheimer v. Johannesen, 470
 Honeycutt v. Phillips, 117
 Hood v. Hagler, 197
 Hopkins v. Fox & Lazo Realtors, 475
 Hopper v. Carey, 341
 Hopstetter v. Nichols, 576
 Horton v. Harwick Chem. Corp., 199
 Horton v. Reaves, 17, 32, 34
 Howell v. Biggart, 436
 Howell v. New York Post Co., 83
 Howell v. Winters, 43
 Huddell v. Levin, 718
 Huff v. Tracy, 591
 Huff v. White Motor Corp., 717
 Hughes v. Klein, 451
 Hughes v. Lord Advocate, 250
 Hull v. Eaton Corp., 682
 Humphrey v. National Semiconductor Corp., 797
 Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Falwell, 792, 803
 Huston v. Konieczny, 198-200
 Hutchinson v. Proxmire, 818
 Hyler v. Boyter, 588
 Hymowitz v. Eli Lilly and Company, 201, 205

 Iervolino v. Pittsburgh Athletic Co., 568
 Immerman v. Ostertag, 550
 Impellizzeri v. Jamesville Federated Church, 759
 In re Coordinated Latex Glove Litigation, 670, 671, 674
 Indian Towing Co. v. United States, 347
 Indiana Harbor Belt R. Co. v. American Cyanamid Co., 654
 Intermountain Farmers Ass'n v. Fitzgerald, 151

- Isaacs v. Huntington Memorial Hospital, 485
- Isaacson v. Boston, Worcester & N.Y. St. Ry., 130n
- J. C. Penney Co. v. Sumrall, 478
- Jackson v. Clark & Fay, Inc., 838
- Jackson v. K-Mart Corporation, 479-480
- Jacques v. First Nat'l Bank, 237
- James v. Bessemer Processing Co., 702
- James v. Gannet Co. Inc., 779
- James v. Lieb*, 528-532
- Jenoff v. Hearst Corp., 809
- Jensen v. Intermountain Health Care, Inc.*, 297, 305
- Jensen v. Sport Bowl, Inc., 834
- Jimenez v. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 713
- Joel v. Morison, 404
- John R. Thompson & Co. v. Vildibill, 607
- Johnson v. Johnson, 775
- Johnson v. Queenan*, 795, 799
- Jones v. Billings, 461
- Jones v. City of Los Angeles, 594
- Jones v. Palmer Communications, Inc., 809
- Jones v. Three Rivers Management Corp.*, 560, 567, 571
- Jordan v. Baptist Three Rivers Hospital*, 574, 579, 583
- Joye v. Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., 478
- Juhl v. Airington, 190
- Kaczkowski v. Bolubasz*, 596, 600
- Kaplan v. Haines, 439, 441
- Kathleen K. v. Robert B., 53
- Katz v. Bd. of Med. & Osteopathic Examiners, 628
- Kaufman v. Boston Dye House, Inc., 645
- Keen v. Maxey, 436
- Kelly v. Easton, 747
- Kelly v. Grinell, 236
- Kelsey v. Barney, 109
- Kenan v. Bass, 314
- Kennedy v. Providence Hockey Club, Inc., 333
- Kern v. St. Joseph's Hospital*, 359, 360, 364
- Kernan v. American Dredging Co., 146
- Kessler v. Mortenson, 465
- Ketterer v. Armour & Co., 667
- Kevorkian v. American Medical Association, 813
- Khawar v. Globe International, Inc.*, 815
- Kimble v. Foster, 485
- King v. Kayak Manufacturing Corp., 333
- King v. Railway Express Agency, 589
- King v. Tanner, 828
- Kingston v. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.*, 181
- Kinsman Transit Co. v. City of Buffalo, 547
- Kirk v. Washington State University, 334
- Kittredge v. Elliott, 636
- Kituskie v. Corbman, 456
- Klahr v. Winterble, 809
- Klanseck v. Anderson Sales and Service*, 335, 336
- Klein v. Catalano, 364
- Klein v. Duchess Sandwich Co., 667
- Klein v. Pyrodyne Corp.*, 643, 646, 648
- Klein v. W. Hodgman and Sons, Inc., 584
- Kleinke v. Farmers Cooperative Supply & Shipping, 542
- Kline v. Kline, 41
- Klopp v. The Wackenhut Corp., 482
- Knorpp v. Hale*, 467
- Knowles v. United States*, 619, 626
- Koepnick v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, 736, 741
- Konchar v. Cebular, 101-103
- Koos v. Roth, 652
- Kraemer v. Harding, 84
- Krahn v. LaMeres, 113
- Krause Inc. v. Little, 588
- Kuhns v. Brugger, 101-103
- Kunau v. Pillers, Pillers & Pillers, 76
- Kurtz v. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 82
- Labadie v. Semler, 22
- Lach v. Fleth, 601
- Lacy v. CSX Transportation, Inc.*, 370, 380
- Laird v. Nelms, 343
- Lakewood Engineering and Manufacturing Co. v. Quinn, 741
- Landeros v. Flood, 419-421
- Lane v. Holloway, 57
- Langan v. Valicopters, Inc., 649
- Lapeyrouse v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 575
- Largey v. Rothman*, 439
- Larsen v. General Motors Corporation, 717
- Laureano v. Louzoun*, 243, 244
- Law v. Superior Court*, 335
- Lawrence v. Eastern Airlines, Inc., 770
- Laws v. Webb, 315
- Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc.*, 28, 30, 36
- Leiker v. Gafford, 592
- Leonard v. Conquest, 130n
- Letter Carriers v. Austin, 792
- Levitt v. Peluso*, 411

- Lewis v. Rodriguez, 429
 Liberti v. Walt Disney World Co., 83
 Lineaweaver v. John Wanamaker
 Philadelphia, 102
 Linear v. Armour of America, 681
 Liney v. Chestnut Motors, Inc., 282
 Lisa M. v. Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial
 Hospital, 407
 Lister v. Campbell, 461
 Litchfield Company of South Carolina,
 Inc. v. Sur-Tech, Inc., 332
 Lockowitz v. Melnyk, 411
 Lombas v. Southern Foods, Inc., 576
 Loop v. Litchfield, 656
Lord v. Lovett, 213, 216
 Losee v. Clute, 656
Loth v. Truck-A-Way Corp., 590
 Louisiana ex rel. Guste v. M/V
 Testbank, 550
 Louisville Baseball Club v. Butler, 568
 Louisville Trust Co. v. Nutting, Ky, 463
 Love v. Port Clinton, 29
 Lucas v. Hamm, 550
 Luna v. Shockey Sheet Metal & Welding Co.,
 372
Lundy v. Adamar of New Jersey, Inc.,
 505, 506, 511
 Lyons v. Lederle Laboratories, 629
*Lyons v. Midnight Sun Transportation
 Services, Inc.*, 174, 178
 Lyons v. R.I. Public Employees Council, 774
- M. Miller Co. v. Central Contra Costa
 Sanitary Dist., 550
 MacDonald v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.,
 709
 MacDonald v. Perry, 757, 768
 MacDougall v. Pennsylvania Power and
 Light, 102
MacPherson v. Buick Motor Company, 653,
 654, 655, 656, 659, 662
 Madison v. Yunker, 809
 Maguire v. Pabst Brewing Co., 653
 Maki v. Murray Hospital, 446, 448
 Malapanis v. Shirazi, 360
 Mallory v. Ohio University, 794
 Mangeris v. Gordon, 528
 Mangini v. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco
 Co., 144
 Mann v. Fairbourn, 115
 Manning v. Nobile, 130
 Manuel v. St. John the Baptist School Bd.,
 575
- Marcone v. Penthouse International
 Magazine for Men, 800
 Mark v. State Department of Fish and
 Wildlife, 759
 Martignetti v. Haigh-Farr, Inc., 397
 Martin v. Abbott Labs, 206
 Martin v. Amoco Oil Company, 734
 Martin v. Angel City Baseball Assn., 568
Martin v. Herzog, 136
 Martino v. Park Jefferson Racing Assn., 179
Marty v. State of Idaho, 743, 745
 Maryland Heights Leasing, Inc. v.
 Mallickrodt, Inc., 735
 Mason v. Keeling, 635
 Mathews v. Dousay, 577
 Mattingly v. Sheldon Jackson College, 552
 Maysonet v. KFC, National Management
 Co., 487
 Mayo v. Publix Super Markets, Inc., 159
 McAndrew v. Scranton Republican
 Publishing Co., 786
McCain v. Florida Power Corp., 247, 251, 254
 McCarthy v. Olin Corp., 695
McCarty v. Pheasant Run, Inc., 95, 154
McClenahan v. Cooley, 277, 279
 McComish v. DeSoi, 155
McCoy v. American Suzuki Motor Corp., 514
 McCutcheon v. United Homes
 Corp., 320
 McDaniel v. McNeil Laboratories, Inc.,
 703, 705
*McDonald's Restaurants of California, Inc. v.
 O'Connor*, 399, 402
McGraw v. St. Joseph's Hospital, 434, 437
McIntyre v. Balentine, 297, 298
 McKee v. Evans, 105
 McKellips v. Saint Francis Hosp., Inc., 215
 McKelvey v. McKelvey, 354, 358
 McLaughlin v. Sullivan, 238
 McQuade v. Tucson Tiller Apartments, 759
McQuiggan v. Boy Scouts of America, 49, 50,
 54, 57
 Meistrich v. Casino Arena Attractions, Inc.,
 330
 Mencher v. Chelsey, 779
 Mercado v. Ahmed, 594
Merrill v. Central Maine Power Co., 457, 460
 Meyers v. Southern Builders, Inc., 589
 Migliori v. Airborne Freight Corp., 537
Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co., 788, 789,
 790, 793
Miller v. Eichhorn, 335
 Miller v. National Broadcasting Co., 86
Miller v. Willbanks, 78

- Milliken & Co. v. Consolidated Edison Co., 545
 Minnich v. Ashland Oil Co., 198
 Mitchell v. Rochester R. Co., 529
 Mitchell v. Volkswagenwerk, AG, 718
 Moning v. Alfonso, 231
 Montgomery v. Knox, 798
 Moody v. Blanchard Place Apartments, 596
 Moody v. Delta Western, Inc., 514, 516
 Moore v. Albertson's Inc., 482
 Moore v. Mobile Infirmary Ass'n, 628
 Moore v. Standard Paint & Glass of Pueblo, 184, 187, 482
 Morejon v. Rais Construction Co., 166
 Morgan v. State, 564
 Morgen v. Ford Motor Co., 341
 Morris v. Savoy, 628
 Morson v. Superior Court, 673
 Morton v. Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., 678
 Mostert v. CBL & Associates, 232
 Mounsey v. Ellard, 130
 Mulgrew v. Taunton, 797
 Muniz v. White, 28
 Munsy v. Webb, 223
 Murray v. Pittsburgh Athletic Co., 568
 Musch v. H-D Cooperative, Inc., 180
 Musick v. United States of America, 348
 Myhaver v. Knutson, 104
 Myrlak v. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, 671, 674
 NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co., 826
 Nadel v. Burger King Corporation, 81
 Nailor v. C.W. Blakeslee & Sons, Inc., 752
 Nalee, Inc. v. Jacobs, 168
 Nash v. Kamrath, 337
 Natanson v. Kline, 440
 Neary v. Charleston Area Medical Center, Inc., 435
 Nelson v. Carroll, 23, 31, 36, 52, 70
 Nelson v. Concrete Supply Company, 331
 Nelson v. Freeland, 493, 496, 497, 498
 Nettleton v. Thompson, 142, 150
 Neumann v. Shlansky, 114
 New York Times v. Sullivan, 792, 802, 803, 805, 806, 807, 820, 825, 827
 Newbury v. Yogel, 258
 Newton v. Magill, 499, 506
 Neville v. Department of Family Services, 430
 Nisivoccia v. Glass Gardens, Inc., 475, 477
 Nodar v. Galbreath, 798
 Norgaard v. Nodak Mutual Insurance Company, 849
 North Hardin Developers, Inc. v. Corkran, 457, 462, 465
 Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Transport Workers Union of American, AFL-CIO, et al., 375
 Nowatske v. Osterloh, 417, 421
 Oberly v. Bangs Ambulance, Inc., 844, 847, 852
 O'Brien v. Hazelet & Erdal, 364
 O'Brien v. Muskin Corp., 683, 695
 Olin v. Moore, 414
 Oliver v. Miles, 194
 Olsen v. McGillicuddy, 144
 Olson v. Ische, 191
 O'Neil v. Bergan, 453
 Orlo v. Connecticut Co., 530
 Osborn v. Irwin Memorial Blood Bank, 417, 420
 Osborne v. McMasters, 137
 Oshiek v. Oshiek, 353, 354
 Oswin v. Shaw, 843
 Otis Engineering Corp. v. Clark, 223, 234
 Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd. v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co. (The Wagon Mound), 262
 Owens v. Publix Supermarkets, Inc., 480
 Paccar, Inc. v. NHTSA, 724
 Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Haslip, 612
 Paige v. Bing Construction Co., 356
 Palsgraf v. Long Island Railway Co., 221, 222, 226-228, 230, 240, 251, 254
 Parrot v. Wells, Fargo & Co., 91, 93, 110
 Parsons v. Crown Disposal Co., 240
 Paul v. Imperial Palace, Inc., 588
 Paulson v. Andicochea, 481
 Pearce v. Barham, 309
 Peete v. Blackwell, 606, 607, 610
 Pennington v. Meredith Corp., 786
 People Express Airlines, Inc. v. Consolidated Rail Corp., 544, 547, 548
 People v. Sirhan, 820
 Peoples Bank and Trust Co. v. Mountain Home v. Globe International Publishing, Inc., 828
 Perez v. Las Vegas Medical Center, 214
 Perez v. McConkey, 332, 572
 Perreira v. Rediger, 619
 Perricone v. DiBartolo, 113
 Pestey v. Cushman, 751, 759

- Peterson v. Taylor*, 111
Petition of Kinsman Transit Co., 260
Petriello v. Kalman, 213, 216
Pfeiffer v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 700
Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps, 792, 822
Piner v. Superior Court, 376, 377
Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Horton, 246
Plesha v. Edmonds, 142-143
Ploof v. Putnam, 744, 749
Plumley v. Klein, 355
Polemis, In re, 243, 245, 262, 283
Polmatier v. Russ, 16, 18, 36, 139
Poole v. City of Rolling Meadows, 316
Pope v. Pinkerton-Hays Lumber Co., 248
Portee v. Jaffee, 533, 534
Porter v. Delmarva Power & Light Co., 466
Potter v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., 695
Potts v. Armour & Co., 169
Poyner v. Loftus, 119
Prevost v. Cowan, 578
Price v. Blaine Kern Artista, Inc., 277, 278, 281
Price v. Halstead, 191
Priel v. R.E.D., Inc., 257
The Propeller Monticello v. Mollison, 619
Pruitt v. Zeiger, 421
Public Service Co. of Colorado v. Van Wyk, 735
Purtle v. Shelton, 114

Quinn v. Mississippi State Univ., 323

Rabideau v. City of Racine, 529, 540
Rael v. F&S Co., 584, 588
Rajkovich v. Alfred Mossner Co., 741
Ramey v. Winn-Dixie Montgomery, Inc., 478
Ramp v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., 452
Raney v. Walter O. Moss Regional Hospital, 271
Ratcliff v. San Diego Baseball Club, 568
Rauton v. Pullman, 353
Ray v. Atlantic Richfield Co., 724
Read v. Carpenter, 38
Reck v. Stevens, 258
Redding v. Carlton, 786
Redwine v. Fitzhugh, 741
Reeser v. Yellow Freight Sys., Inc., 839
Reeves v. Gentile, 388
Regional Transp. Dist. v. Voss, 846
Reid v. Brodsky, 759
Ress v. X-tra Super Food Ctrs., 478

Reynolds Metals Co. v. Lampert, 618
Reynolds v. Graves, 423
Reynolds v. Strauss Veal, Inc., 290
Rhoads v. Heberling, 610
Richard v. Mangion, 49, 54, 57
Richardson v. The Commodore, Inc., 467, 472
Richman v. Charter Arms Corp., 687
Richmond v. Zimbrick Logging, Inc., 599
Richter v. Limax International, 698
Rigdon v. Rigdon, 355
Risley v. Lenwell, 411
Roalson v. Chaney, 76
Robb v. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 528
Roberts v. Gale, 436
Roberts v. Ohio Permanente Med. Group, Inc., 216
Roberts v. Pinkins, 232
Roberts v. Vaughn, 518
Robinson v. Bantam Books, Inc., 779
Robinson v. Lindsay, 111
Robinson v. Pioche, Bayerque & Co., 123
Roderick v. Lake, 377, 382
Rodgers v. Kemper Constr. Co., 407
Roe v. Wade, 555
Roig v. Kelsey, 843
Roman Catholic Diocese of Covington v. Sector, 394
Romana v. Boston Elevated Ry., 130n
Rosa v. Dunkin' Donuts, 518
Rosenberg v. Rockville Center Soccer Club, Inc., 167
Rosenblatt v. Baer, 793, 804, 805, 809, 810, 826
Rosenbloom v. Metromedia, Inc., 825
Ross v. Vereb, 289
Rossell v. Volkswagen of America, 417, 426
Rossi v. DelDuca, 749
Roth v. Union Depot Co., 112
Roth v. United States, 826
Rowland v. Christian, 494, 496, 499
Rozny v. Marnul, 549
Ruby v. Easton, 115
Ruffing ex rel. Calton v. Union Carbide Corp., 208
Rugg v. McCarty, 74
Russell v. K-Mart Corp., 242
Russo v. Griffin, Jr., 449, 450, 452
Ryals v. United States Steel Corp., 457, 458
Rylands v. Fletcher, 642, 643, 644, 645, 647

Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Smith, 479
Salgo v. Leland Stanford, Jr. Univ. Bd. of Trustees, 439, 440

- Sallady v. Old Dominion Copper Mining & Smelting Co., 465
- Sander v. Geib, Elston, Frost Professional Ass'n, 627
- Sandford v. Chevrolet Division of General Motors, 303
- Sandler v. Commonwealth, 131
- Sandler v. Commonwealth, 128
- Sandoval v. Sandoval, 355
- Sanke v. Bechina, 192
- Santiago v. Phoenix Newspapers, Inc., 399, 407
- Sargent v. Ross, 502
- Savina v. Sterling Drug, Inc., 701
- Sawler v. Boston & Albany R.R., 130
- Sawyer v. Dreis & Krump Mfg. Co., 155
- Scanlon v. General Motors, 676
- Scaria v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 423
- Schafer v. American Cyanamid Co., 854
- Schafer v. Hoffman, 255
- Schaffer v. Edward D. Jones & Co., 627
- Schmidt v. Gibbs, 449
- Schroades v. Rental Homes, Inc., 147
- Schroyer v. McNeal, 326, 327
- Schwabe v. Custer's Inn Associates, LLP, 139
- Schwartz v. Bloch, 794
- Scott v. News-Herald, 789
- Scott v. Pacific West Mountain Resort, 324, 335
- Scott v. Rizzo, 715
- Scott-Taylor, Inc. v. Stokes, 786
- Seagram v. McGuire, 233
- Sedar v. Knowlton Construction Company, 344, 359, 362
- Seibert v. Vic Regnier Builders, Inc., 483
- Senn v. Sun Printing Co., 331
- Shackil v. Lederle Laboratories, 212
- Shaw v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 795, 798, 799, 800, 802
- Shearer v. Homestake, 835
- Sheehan v. Goriansky, 130n
- Sheehan v. Tobin, 797
- Sheridan v. Catering Management, Inc., 840
- Shinn v. Allen, 189
- Short v. Pierce County, 746
- Shugar v. Guill, 606, 608
- Shull v. B.F. Goodrich, 160, 161, 170
- Shyface v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 858
- Sikora v. Wenzel, 135, 146, 149
- Silesky v. Kelman, 356
- Silvester v. American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., 813
- Sindell v. Abbott Labs, 203, 204, 208
- Singer v. Marx, 48
- Sinram v. Pennsylvania R. Co., 261
- Sioux City & Pacific R.R. Co. v. Stout, 462
- Sitzes v. Anchor Motor Freight, Inc., 370, 376
- Siver v. Atlantic Union College, 130
- Slack v. Farmers Insurance Exchange, 391
- Slayton v. McDonald, 59, 64
- Smith v. Cedar Rapids Country Club, 473
- Smith v. Dep't of Ins., 628
- Smith v. Ingersoll-Rand Co., 710, 711
- Smith v. Jalbert, 637, 645
- Smith v. Postal Telegraph Cable Co., 531
- Smith v. Smith, 299
- Smith v. Sneller, 121, 122
- Smith v. Stone, 729
- Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp., 627
- Sorrells v. M.Y.B. Hospitality Ventures of Asheville, 309
- Soule v. General Motors Corp., 679
- Spade v. Lynn & Boston R. Co., 529, 530
- Spahn v. Town of Port Royal, 315
- Spangler v. Helm's New York-Pittsburgh Motor Exp., 581
- Spano v. Perini Corp., 646
- Sparks v. Owens-Illinois, Inc., 679
- Spencer v. A-1 Crane Serv., Inc., 580
- Sperry-New Holland v. Prestage, 686
- Spring Co. v. Edgar, 635
- Spur Industries v. Del E. Webb Development Co., 756, 758, 761
- Srb v. Board of County Commissioners, 746
- St. Amant v. Thompson, 804, 806, 820
- Staples v. Hoefke, 735
- State, ex rel. Bishop v. Bd. of Edn., 364
- State, ex rel. Fox v. Board of Trustees of the City of Bluefield, et al., 436
- State Department of Transportation v. Hill, 538, 539
- State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell, 606, 610, 616
- State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Mendenhall, 312
- State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Peiffer, 844, 852
- State v. Batson, 48
- State v. Eaton, 538
- State v. Guinn, 602
- State v. Hall, 63
- State v. Phipps, 29
- State v. Powell, 803
- Statler v. Ray Mfg. Co., 657
- Staub v. Staub, 739, 740, 741

- Steelvest, Inc. v. Scansteel Service Ctr., Ky.,
 465
 Steere v. Cupp, 809
 Steinman v. Laundry Co., 25
 Stephens and Kraftco Corp. v. Koch, 257
 Stevens v. Rockport Granite Co., 769
 Stevenson v. Economy Bank of Ambridge,
 601
Stewart v. Motts, 100
 Stock v. Fife, 191
 Stokes v. Puckett, 82
 Stong v. Freeman Truck Line, 140
 Strauss v. Belle Realty Co., 545
Strauss v. Cilek, 75
 Strauss v. Freiheit, 840
Sullivan v. Scoular Grain Company of Utah,
 386
Summers v. Tice, 193, 196, 199, 200, 202,
 203, 205, 211, 212
 Sumpter v. Moulton, 271
Sumpter v. Moulton, 272
 Supreme Beef Processors, Inc. v. Maddox,
 138
 Surocco v. Geary, 747
 Surrency v. Harbison, 607
 Swagger v. City of Crystal, 332
 Szabo v. Pennsylvania R.R. Co., 507
 Szekeres v. Robinson, 555, 557

 Talarico v. Bonham, 271
 Talley v. Danek Medical, Inc., 145
 Tanner v. USA Today, 409
 Tarasoff v. Regents of Univ. of California,
 520, 521, 523, 524, 527
Taylor v. Barwick, 36, 46
 Taylor v. Churchill Valley Country Club,
 567
 Taylor v. Hesser, 653
Taylor v. Jackson, 264, 268
 Tennyson v. Brower, 271
 Tenuto v. Lederle Laboratories, 527
 Theriot v. Allstate Ins. Co., 575
 Thing v. La Chusa, 536
Thomas v. Harrah's Vicksburg Corp., 729,
 730, 731, 733
Thomas v. McDonald, 136, 139
 Thomas v. Winchester, 656, 657
 Thompson v. City of Philadelphia, 287
 Thompson v. County of Alameda, 524
 Thompson v. Ford Motor Co., 151
 Thompson v. Port Authority of New York,
 588
 Thompson v. Summers, 516

 Thompson v. Zero Bullet Co., 653
 Thornhill v. Alabama, 826
 Thrifty-Tel, Inc., 735
Tieder v. Little, 247, 254
 Time, Inc. v. Firestone, 812
The T.J. Hooper, 152, 418
 Toney v. Mazariegos, 116
 Torres v. El Paso Elec. Co., 242, 246
 Torres v. Xomox Corporation, 266
 Totten v. Adongay, 436
Trahan-Laroche v. Lockheed Sanders, Inc.,
 399
 Travelers Indem. Co. v. Barnes, 846
 Truque v. Service Merchandise Corp., 166
Trull v. Volkswagen of America, Inc., 711,
 716, 719, 721, 722
 Tunkl v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 319, 321,
 324
Turnbough v. Ladner, 317
 Turner v. Jordan, 395
 TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources
 Corp., 616n

 Union Pac. R.R. v. State of Idaho, 748
 United Elec. Light Co. v. Deliso Constr. Co.,
 645
 United Proteins, Inc. v. Farmland Inc., 735
 United Servs. Automobile Ass'n v. Aetna
 Cas. & Sur. Co., 414
United States v. Arora, 736, 738
 United States v. Caltex, Inc., 747
 United States v. Carroll Towing Co., 96, 97,
 153
 United States v. Gaubert, 345, 346, 347
 United States v. Rogers & Rogers, 550
 United States v. Varig Airlines, 347

 Vail v. The Plain Dealer Publishing Co., 789
Valance v. VI-Doug, Inc., 480, 482
 Van Arsdale v. Hollinger, 411
 VanBuskirk v. Carey Canadian Mines, Ltd.,
 267
 Van Gordon v. Portland General Electric
 Co., 132
 Vandermay v. Clayton, 453
 VanLuchene v. State, 142
 Varanese v. Gall, 810
Vaughan v. Menlove, 91, 92, 110, 112
 Venezia v. Miller Brewing Co., 722
Vergara v. Doan, 431
 Versland v. Caron Transport, 534
 Victorian Railways Commissioners v.
 Coultas, 530

- Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co.*, 743, 749
- Virginia Elec. And Power Co. v. Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority*, 530
- Voss v. Black & Decker Mfg. Co.*, 689
- Wagenblast v. Odessa School District*, 317, 324
- Wagner v. International Ry. Co.*, 515
- Waicker v. Scranton Times Ltd. Partnership*, 814
- Waldbaum v. Fairchild Publications, Inc.*, 810, 812, 813
- Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Wright*, 153, 157, 159
- Walls v. Oxford Management, Inc.*, 492
- Walser v. Resthaven Memorial Gardens, Inc.*, 739
- Walton v. William Wolf Baking Co.*, 258
- Wampler v. Higgins*, 794
- Warner v. Markoe*, 328
- Warner Fruehauf Trailer Co. v. Boston*, 678, 682
- Washington v. Pic-N-Pay Supermarket, Inc.*, 478
- Wassink v. Hawkins*, 501
- Waters v. Blackshear*, 16, 21, 39
- Watson v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Ins. Co.*, 363
- Watts v. Erickson*, 116
- Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Co. v. Matlock*, 136, 143
- Webb v. City & Borough of Sitka*, 502
- Webb v. Jarvis*, 125
- Weber v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 844, 849
- Weems v. Hy-Vee Food Stores, Inc.*, 284, 285, 289
- Wehbe v. Waguespack*, 577
- Weinstein v. The Islamic Republic of Iran*, 617
- Weise-GMC, Inc. v. Wells*, 595
- Welch v. Southland Corp.*, 394
- West Virginia Central & P.R. Co. v. State*, 222
- Western Union Tel. Co. v. Mathis*, 550
- Whalen v. Union Bag & Paper Co.*, 762
- Whaley v. Catlett*, 580
- Wheeler v. Raybestos-Manhattan*, 209, 211
- Whetstone v. Moravec*, 448
- Whirley v. Whiteman*, 299
- White v. Deseelhorst*, 565
- White v. Muniz*, 28
- White v. University of Idaho*, 33, 36
- Whitted v. General Motors Corp.*, 677, 678
- Whitten v. Commercial Dispatch Publishing Co., Inc.*, 822
- Whitten v. Cox*, 70
- Wieseler v. Sisters of Mercy Health Corp.*, 473
- Williams v. Esaw*, 113
- Williams v. Lee Brick and Tile*, 311
- Wilson v. City of Kotzebue*, 122
- Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co.*, 735
- Wilson v. Johns-Manville Sales Corporation*, 217n
- Wilson v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 537
- Wiltse v. Albertson's Inc.*, 478
- Wollerman v. Grand Union Stores, Inc.*, 476
- Wolston v. Reader's Digest Ass'n, Inc.*, 819
- Wood v. Camp*, 471
- Wood v. Cunard*, 741
- Wood v. McGrath, North, Mullin & Kratz*, 456
- Wooderson v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 699, 708
- Woods v. Cole*, 384
- Woods v. Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.*, 478
- Wright v. Central-DuPage Hosp. Ass'n*, 628
- Wright v. Norfolk and Western Railway Co.*, 294
- Wynberg v. National Enquirer, Inc.*, 800
- Yancey v. Boston Elevated Ry.*, 130n
- Yania v. Bigan*, 510
- Ybarra v. Spangard*, 445
- Young v. Garwacki*, 502
- Young v. Warren*, 59
- Younger v. Dow Corning Corp.*, 710
- Zalnis v. Thoroughbred Datsun Car Co.*, 73
- Zimmerman v. Valdak Corp.*, 836
- Zink v. Foss*, 130n

TABLE OF STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

UNITED STATES

Code

15 U.S.C. §1381	723
15 U.S.C. §1391(2)	724
15 U.S.C. §1392(a)	724
15 U.S.C. §1392(d)	723, 724, 725
15 U.S.C. §1397(k)	723, 724n
28 U.S.C. §1346	343
28 U.S.C. §1346(b)	342, 343, 344
28 U.S.C. §1346(b)(1)	341, 342, 344
28 U.S.C. §2671 et seq.	344
28 U.S.C. §2674	342
28 U.S.C. §2680	342, 343
28 U.S.C. §2680(a)	342, 343, 345, 346
33 U.S.C. §2702	647
42 U.S.C. §§300aa-1	854
to 300aa-34	
42 U.S.C. §§300aa-11(a)	856
42 U.S.C. §§300aa-11(a)(9)	857
42 U.S.C. §9607	647
45 U.S.C. §53	299
46 U.S.C. §484	153
46 U.S.C. §§741-752	343
46 U.S.C. §766	299
46 U.S.C. §§781-790	343

Constitution

Amendment I	804
-------------	-----

Public Laws

107-42	858
--------	-----

Regulations

49 C.F.R. 392.22(b)(1)	140
------------------------	-----

ALABAMA

Code

§6-5-186	829
§6-5-332	510

ALASKA

Statutes

§04.21.020(a)	236
§09.17.060	315, 712
§09.17.900	315
§09.55.580(a)-(c)	582
§34.03.010-380	500
§34.03.100(a)(1)	501
§34.03.120(1)	501

ARIZONA		Civ. Proc. Code	
		\$337.15	365
Revised Statutes		\$667.7(e)(4)	418
\$3-1421	642		
\$3-1427	642		
\$12-554	571	Evidence Code	
\$12-2505(A)	338		
\$12-2506	363, 364, 377, 378, 379	\$669	152
\$12-2506(A)	378, 379		
\$12-2506(B)	378		
\$12-2506(D)	378	Health and Safety Code	
\$12-2506(F)(2)	378		
\$36-601	768	\$25967	144
		Penal Code	
ARKANSAS		\$308	144, 145
Code		Statutes	
\$16-114-206	443		
\$16-116-105	726	1891, ch. 70, §1	144
		COLORADO	
		Revised Statutes	
CALIFORNIA			
Civ. Code			
		§§10-4-701 to -723	844
		§10-4-702	846
\$43.92	524	§10-4-706(1)	844n
\$45	787	§13-21-102(1)(a)	617
\$45a	786	§13-21-102(3)	617
\$45(a)	787	§13-21-111	304
\$46	787	§13-21-111.5	384, 391, 392, 394, 396
\$48a	787		392, 393
\$48(a)(1)	828	§13-21-111.5(1)	392
\$48(a)(2)	828	§13-21-111.5(3)	623
\$48(a)(4)(d)	828	§13-21-111.6	470
\$48a(d)	801	§13-21-115	570
\$1714.1(a)	144	§13-21-120	696
§§1721-1800	665	§13-21-403	282
§1732	666	§13-21-504(2)	282
§1735	667	§13-21-504(3)	776
§1769	665, 666	§13-25-125.5	65
§3333.1(c)(2)	418	§18-1-704.5	65
§3333.2(c)(2)	418	§776.012	65
§3425.3	776	§776.013	65

CONNECTICUT

General Statutes

§52-240b	617
§52-557a	471
§52-572h(g)(3)	398
§53a-13	19
§53a-54a(a)	19

DELAWARE

Statutes

tit. 25 §1501	465
---------------	-----

FLORIDA

Statutes

§768.73(1)(a)	617
§768.73(1)(b)	617
§768.81	304
§768.095	801
§768.1256	726
§776.012	65
§776.013(1)(a), (b)	65

GEORGIA

Code

§43-43A-7(1)	565
§51-3-2	471
§51-12-5.1	617

HAWAII

Statutes

§577-3	118
§663-10.9	381
§663-10.95(a)	325

IDAHO

Code

§6-1012	433
§6-1101	566
§46-1001 et seq.	748
§46-1002(3)	748
§46-1008(2)	748
§46-1011(1)	748
§46-1017	748
§73-116	747

ILLINOIS

Statutes

205 §665/17	761
735 §5/13-214.3(b)	366
735 §5/13-214.3(c)	366
740 §130/2	497
740 §130/3	497

INDIANA

Code

§9-19-10-7	341
§16-36-4-20	290
§16-36-5-26	290
§34-6-2-29	664
§34-6-2-45	340

IOWA

<i>Comparative Fault Act</i>	336
------------------------------	-----

KANSAS

Statutes

§60-3701(e)	618
-------------	-----

§60-3701(f) 618
 §381.231 462
 §381.231(1) 463
 §381.232 456, 457, 462, 463

LOUISIANA

Revised Statutes

§13:4721 761
 §14:49 801
 §14:103A 58
 §38:383 577
 §50 801

MAINE

Statutes

tit. 24 §2931 558
 tit. 32 §15217(A) 565

MARYLAND

Acts

1986, Chapter 122 238

MASSACHUSETTS

General Laws

ch. 21, §17C 128, 130, 131
 ch. 112, §12-1/2 796
 ch. 231, §60D 365
 ch. 260, §2A 360

MICHIGAN

Statutes

§600.2911(2)(b) 828
 §600.2911(6) 828
 §600.2911(7) 828
 §600.2912a 433
 §600.2946 696
 §600.2971 558
 §691.1544(4) 566

MINNESOTA

Statutes

§347.22 635, 636
 §604.01 304
 §604.02 398
 §604A.01 Sub 1. 512

MISSISSIPPI

Code

§63-3-903 140
 §63-7-69(1) 141
 §63-7-71 140
 §63-7-71(1) 141
 §63-7-71(2) 141
 §73-25-37 511
 §85-5-7 381
 §85-5-7(1) 315

MISSOURI

Revised Statutes

§307.178(4) 340
 §567.010 760
 §567.080 760
 §578.430 761

NEVADA

Revised Statutes

§40-140	760
§41A.100	437
§42.005(1)	618
§442.250	555
§569.450	642

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Revised Statutes

§146-A:3-a	647
§146-A:11-a	647
§266:63	400

NEW JERSEY

Statutes

§2A:15-5.6	235
§2A:15-5.3	381
§2A:15-97	619, 621, 622
§2A:53A-15	117
§2A:58C-2	675
§2A:58C-2a	675, 677
§2A:58C-8	670
§2A:62A-1	507, 509
§2A:62A-21	518
§2C:3-6(b)(2)	72
§2C:3-6(b)(3)	72
§39:6A-4	843
§39:6A-8	843

NEW MEXICO

Statutes

§41-3A-1	383
§52-3-32	246
§52-3-33	246

NEW YORK

C.P.L.R.

§208	206, 207
§214	207
§214(4)	206
§214(5)	206
§214-c	207, 208
§214-c(1)	206
§214-c(2)	206
§214-c(6)	206

Highway Law

§329a	136
-------	-----

Insurance Law

§5102[d]	847
----------	-----

Jud. Ct. Acts

Vehicle and Traffic Law

§388	412, 414
------	----------

Workers' Comp. Law

§15	840
-----	-----

NORTH DAKOTA

Cent. Code

§12.1-05-06	71
§20.1-01-05	851
§26-41	847, 848, 849, 850, 852
§26-41-02	850
§26-41-03	851
§26-41-03(11)	851
§26-41-05	851

\$26-41-07	849, 850	\$32-38-1	340
\$26-41-07(1)	850	\$32-38-4	340
\$26-41-08	851	\$40-34-2	638
\$32-03.2-11(4)	618	\$40-34-13	761
		\$62-3-2	834
OHIO		Constitution	
Statutes		Article VI, §2	628, 630
\$2305.131	363, 364	Article VI, §6	627, 628
\$4171.06	325		
\$4171.07	325		
\$4171.09	325		
\$5321.03(A)(1)	147		
\$5321.03(A)(2)	147		
OKLAHOMA		TENNESSEE	
Statutes		Code	
tit. 23, §9.1(B)-(D)	618	\$20-5-102	582, 583
		\$20-5-106	582
		\$20-5-113	580, 582, 583
		\$29-28-103	366
		\$29-28-104	727
		\$50-6-102(12)	838
		\$50-6-225(e)(3)	837
		\$57-1-101, 57-10-101	276
		\$57-1-102, 57-10-102	276
RHODE ISLAND		TEXAS	
Statutes		Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code	
\$11-56-1	512	§16.001	365
\$23-20.6-2(a)	761	§16.001(b)	366
SOUTH CAROLINA		UTAH	
Code Annotated		Code	
\$15-5-170	353	§35-1-60	387
		§68-3-11	387
SOUTH DAKOTA			
Code			
\$21-3-11	627, 628, 629, 630		

\$68-3-12	306
\$68-3-12(6)	306
\$76-2-406	71
\$78-27-37(1)	387, 390
\$78-27-37(2)	390
\$78-27-38	387, 388, 389
\$78-27-38(4)	390
\$78-27-39	387, 388
\$78-27-40	387, 388
\$78-27-51	561, 562
§§78-27-51 to 54	560, 561, 562, 563
\$78-27-52(1)	560, 561, 562
\$78-27-53	561, 562
\$78-27-54	561, 562, 563
<i>Comparative Negligence Act</i>	305

VERMONT**Statutes**

tit. 12 §1036	565
tit. 12 §1037	565
tit. 12 §519(a)	511

VIRGINIA**Code**

§8.01-38.1	618
§8.01-581.15	623, 624, 625
§15.2-5202	351
§32.1-156	351

Constitution

Article I, §11	625, 626
----------------	----------

WASHINGTON**Revised Code**

\$4.22.015	395
------------	-----

\$5.40.050	151
\$7.72	514

WEST VIRGINIA**Code**

\$55-7-13	375
\$55-7A-2	118
\$55-7B-7	435, 436

WISCONSIN**Statutes**

§809.61	422
§940.34(2)(a)	512
§940.34(d)(1)	512

WYOMING**Code**

§1-1-109	316
----------	-----

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS

§432	195
§577, comment b	783
§606	791
§876(b), comment, illus. 3	195
§876(b)(c)	195

RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS

Generally	17, 18, 28, 102, 125-126, 128, 273, 636-637, 651, 654, 681, 858
§2	20

§2, comment b	20	§218(c)	735, 738
§7	26	§221	737
§7, comment b	26	§221, comment b	737
§8A	20, 21, 733	§222A	739
§12(1)	132	§222A(1)	739
§13	16, 24, 49	§222A(2)	739
§13, comment d	20	§226	739
§14, comment b	19	§281(b)	241
§15, comment b	31	§281(b), comment c	241
§16	31, 47	§283	109
§16, comment a	31	§283, comment c	92
§16(1)	48	§283A	115, 117
§16(2)	47, 48	§283A, comment b	115
§18	33	§283B	124
§19	30, 44	§288A	148, 150
§19, comment a	30, 44	§288B	148
§20	47	§289	154
§21	43	§289, comment m	109
§24	45	§290, comment a	132
§27	44	§291	98
§29, comment b	43	§292	98
§29, comment c, illus. 4	43	§293	98
§31	43, 44	§298, comment b	101
§31, comment a	43	§299A	420
§46	75	§299A, comment g	451
§46, comment d	74, 77	§314A	507, 508
§46, comment e	74	§315	233, 520
§46, comment e, illus. 5	75	§315-320	521
§46, comment f	74	§316-318	524
§46, comment g	74	§324	508, 509
§46, comment j	75, 81	§332	468, 468n, 469, 470
§46, comment l	88	§339	461, 462, 463, 465
§46(1)	83	§339, comment j	465
§46(1), comment i	83	§339, comment m	461
§46(2)	87	§343	473, 474, 478
§46(2)(a)	87	§343, comment b	473
§46(2)(b)	87, 88	§343, comment e	473
§63	67, 81	§344	484, 486
§63, comment b	64	§344, comment f	484
§63, comment i	64	§345	749
§65	64, 66	§402A	668, 669, 678, 696, 698, 700, 708, 710, 714
§77	70	§402A, comment h	700
§158	733	§402A, comment j	702
§162	733	§402A, comment k	703, 704, 705, 706, 707
§162, comment f	733	§430, comment a	241
§163, comment a	734	§431	264, 265, 267
§163, comment b	734	§432(2)	188
§196	746	§433	187, 265
§196, comment g	748	§433, comment a	268, 273
§217	736	§433, comment d	186, 268
§217(b)	739	§433, comment f	270
§218	735, 737, 738, 742		
§218, comment d	737		
§218, comment e	737		
§218(b)	739		

§433(a)	185, 267, 268
§433(c), comment f	270
§433B, comment d	366
§433B(3)	199, 202
§434	267
§435	253, 274
§435, comment d	227
§435(1)	266
§435(2)	253
§440	287, 289
§447	236, 280, 287
§453	274
§453, comment b	274, 287
§457	285
§457, comment b	289
§461, comment a	257
§496A, comment c	328
§500	83, 84, 131
§504	640
§506	637
§507	640
§507, comment c	641
§509	640
§515	638, 653
§518	639, 640, 641
§519	645, 649
§520	649, 650, 654
§520, comment f	645, 649, 650
§520, comment h	650
§520, comment i	650
§520, comment p.	646
§520 (3)	646
§558	774, 796
§566, comment a	791, 792
§568	796
§569	784
§569, comment b	784
§570	783
§575	783
§575, comment b	783
§577A	777
§821B	758, 759
§821B, comment d	758
§821D	752
§822	753
§822, comment k	753
§826, comment c	752
§840D	770
§876	190, 192
§876, comment d	190
§876(a)	192
§876(b)	190, 192, 195, 205
§876(c)	192, 195
§892, comment c	51
§892B, illus. 5	53

§895C(2)	352
§895J, comment c	19
§908, comment e	616
§908(2)	618
§912	218
§920A(2)	620
§920A(2), comment b	620
§924, comment c	600
§928	595

RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF AGENCY

Generally	395
§220	396
§220, comment h	398
§220, comment m	398
§228	394

RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS

Generally	18, 165, 241, 396
§2	131
§6	707
§6, comment b	241
§6(c)	705, 706
§6(c), comment f	706
§9(c)	124
§19, comment c, Reporter's notes	391
§19, comment g	391
§20	651
§22	637
§25	638, 653
§26	254
§29, comment d	255

RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS: PRODUCTS LIABILITY

Generally	695, 697, 702-703
§§1 to 21	703
§1	669
§2	669, 701, 702
§2, comment 1	702
§2, comment n	692

§2(b)	692, 695, 697
§2(c)	698
§3	675, 676
§3(a)	677
§3(b)	677
§402A	678

UNIFORM ACTS

Uniform Commercial Code

§2-314	663
§2-314[2][c]	688, 690

§2-315	663
§2-318	663, 688, 690

Uniform Comparative Fault Act

Generally	323
-----------	-----

Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act

Generally	338, 377, 378
-----------	---------------

INDEX

- Abnormally dangerous activities, 642-654
 - assumption of risk, 710-716
 - community value, 646-653
 - comparative negligence, 638, 653
 - dams, 643-646
 - environmental harms, 647
 - fireworks displays, 648-651
 - test, 649-654
 - Additur*, 577-578
 - Alternative liability theory, 193-198, 199-200, 205, 211
 - burden of proof, 208
 - modified alternative liability, 201-212
 - and several liability, 382-383
 - Animal injuries, 633-642
 - domesticated animals, 634, 639-641
 - negligence liability
 - for domesticated animals, 633-644
 - for trespassing domesticated animals, 639-641
 - property damage, 633
 - statutory liability, 633, 635, 642
 - strict liability
 - for domesticated animals, 635, 637
 - property damage, 633
 - rationale for, 638
 - for trespassing animals, 642
 - for wild animals, 633, 639
 - wild animals, 633, 634, 635, 639
 - Answer to complaint, 3, 17
 - Appeals, 4
 - Apportionment of liability
 - absent actors, 386, 390-391
 - alternative liability. *See* Alternative liability theory
 - comparative negligence, 302-303 *See also* Comparative negligence
 - concerted action. *See* Concerted action theory
 - exemplary and compensatory damages, 396
 - immune actors, 386-390
 - insolvent defendants, 397-399
 - between intentional and negligent tort-feasors, 391-397
 - joint and several liability. *See* Joint and several liability
 - negligence, 206, 303-304, 315-316
 - several liability. *See* Several liability
 - vicarious liability
 - respondent superior*. *See* *Respondent superior*
 - of vehicle owners, 411-415
- Assault, 39-49
- apprehension of imminent contact, 40-46
 - and battery, 39
 - conditional threats, 41, 45
 - consent to. *See* Consent
 - defenses
 - consent. *See* Consent
 - defense of others, 62-66
 - defense of property, 65, 66, 67-72
 - proportionality, 59, 64
 - self-defense, 59-62, 63-66
 - intent
 - apprehension of imminent contact, 40-46
 - to cause specific harm, 43
 - transfer of, 46-49
 - objective test for "apprehension," 44
 - protected legal interest, 39, 41

- self-defense, 59-62, 64-67
- subjective test for "apprehension," 44
- transferred intent, 46-49
- Assumption of risk, 317-318
 - express, 317-326
 - implied
 - primary, 319, 326, 559-572
 - secondary, 315-320, 330-335
- Attorney malpractice. *See* Legal malpractice
- Attorney's judgmental immunity, 456
- Avoidable consequences doctrine, 335-341

- Battery, 15-39
 - "accidental" contacts, 23-27
 - act requirement, 16, 18-21
 - assault and, 39
 - consent to. *See* Consent
 - damages, 36-39
 - defenses
 - consent. *See* Consent
 - defense of others, 62-67
 - defense of property, 65, 66, 66-71
 - insanity, 19-20
 - mental incompetency, 31-35
 - proportionality, 59, 64
 - self-defense, 59-62, 64-67
 - direct contacts, 26
 - "harm," defined, 26
 - "inadvertent" contacts, 23-27
 - indirect contacts, 26
 - "injury," defined, 26
 - insanity defense, 19-20
 - intent
 - to cause personal injury, 21, 23-26
 - to contact, 16-23
 - desire or substantial certainty, 22
 - dual, 33-35
 - to harm, 23-27
 - to offend, 28-36
 - requirement, 21
 - transfer of, 46-49
 - mentally deficient plaintiff(s), 31-35
 - offensive contact, 28-36
 - bodily harm from, 35-36
 - protected legal interest, 15-16
 - self-defense, 59-62, 64-67
- Blind "reasonable person" standard, 119-122
- Breach of the peace, 58-59
- Burden of proof
 - alternative liability theory, 205
 - consent, 52
 - medical malpractice, informed consent claims, 443-444
 - medical malpractice, informed consent claims, 443-444
 - negligence. *See* Negligence
- Business licensees and invitees. *See* Landowners and occupiers, *subheading* licensees and invitees
- But-for causation. *See* Negligence
- Bystander recovery, for emotional distress
 - "closely related" persons, 537-539
 - family members, 532-536, 537-539
 - pet owners, 540-543
 - strangers, 537, 539-540

- "Caps" on damages, 623-631
- Categories of torts, 1, 15
- Causation. *See* Negligence
- Chattels
 - conversion of, 738-743
 - trespass to, 736-738, 741-742
- Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, 854-857
- Children. *See* Minors
- Circumstantial evidence, 159, 161
- Collateral source rule, 619-623
- Comparative negligence, 293, 297-304
 - abnormally dangerous activities, 653
 - "all or nothing" recovery, 302
 - apportionment of liability, 302-304
 - contribution, effect on, 374-377
 - historical development of, 298
 - immune actors, allocating responsibility to, 386-391
 - incentive effects of, 305
 - "last clear chance" doctrine, 315
 - of minor, 117
 - modified, 293, 297, 300
 - examples of, 298
 - 49 percent form of, 297, 298, 300, 301
 - 50 percent form of, 297, 298, 300
 - multi-defendant cases, 305-308
 - multi-defendant cases, 305-308
 - products liability, 710-722
 - pure, 293, 297, 300
 - examples of, 298
 - reckless conduct, 311-313, 315-316
 - statutes, 304-305
 - "unit" rule, 306, 308
 - "Wisconsin" rule, 306, 307
- Compensation rationale, 8-14
- Compensatory damages. *See* Damages
 - generally*
- Complaints, 3, 17
- Concerted action
 - and several liability, 384-385
 - theory, 188-193, 202-206

- Consent
- to assault and battery, 49-50
 - burden of proof, 52
 - consent to contact not harm, 52
 - excessive force, 57-58
 - express, 51
 - fraudulently obtained, 53
 - implied, 51-52
 - informed, 53
 - mistaken, 53
 - scope of, 53-58
 - and self-defense, 57
 - to breach of the peace, 58
 - informed. *See* Informed consent
 - Consortium, loss of, 580-581, 582
 - Contribution, 370. *See also* Joint and several liability
 - comparative negligence, effect of, 374-376
 - and *respondeat superior*, 401
 - several liability. *See* Several liability
 - Contributory negligence
 - accident-avoidance, doctrine as incentive for, 297
 - as intervening cause of harm, 289-290
 - "last clear chance" doctrine, 314
 - products liability, 710-722
 - reckless conduct, 308-311
 - and *res ipsa loquitur*, 165-167
 - statutes, 315-316
 - as total bar to recovery, 294-297, 298-299
 - Conversion, 738-742
 - CPR, withholding or withdrawing of, 290-291
 - Criminal attacks
 - landowner's liability, 483-491, 492
 - psychiatrist's duty to protect third parties from, 518-525
 - Criminal law
 - defense of person, 65-66
 - defense of self, 66
 - distinguished, 21
 - duty to assist or render aid, 512-513
 - Criminal trespassers, 458-460
 - Custodial liability, for minor's negligence, 117-118
 - Damages
 - additur*, 577-578
 - apportionment of. *See* Apportionment of liability
 - battery, 36-39
 - "caps" on, 623-631
 - collateral source rule, 619-623
 - consortium, loss of, 580-581, 582
 - contract *versus* tort, 578
 - conversion, 740
 - defamation, 776, 785-786
 - earning capacity, loss of, 598-606
 - "eggshell" plaintiffs, 259
 - failure to mitigate, 336-337
 - future, 574, 576
 - discounting future losses to present value, 600-606
 - general, 573-574, 583-595
 - Golden Rule arguments, 588, 592
 - hedonic, 589-595
 - judge *versus* jury awards, research on, 6-7
 - legal malpractice, 453-456
 - lost wages, 576-577, 596-598
 - medical expenses, 576, 595, 596
 - medical malpractice
 - damage "caps," 623-631
 - "loss of chance" cases, 215-216
 - "mere economic" harm, 543-553
 - nominal, 36, 38
 - for nuisance, in lieu of injunction, 762-764
 - pain and suffering, 575-576, 583-584
 - Golden Rule arguments, 588
 - objective and subjective complaints of, 584-586, 588
 - per diem* arguments, 586-589
 - past, 574, 576
 - for property damage, 594-595
 - punitive. *See* Punitive damages
 - purpose(s) of, 573
 - remittitur*, 577-578
 - special, 595-596
 - defamation actions, 785-786
 - earning capacity, loss of, 598-606
 - lost wages, 596-598
 - medical expenses, 576, 595, 596
 - structured settlements, 605-606
 - survival statutes, 574, 579-583
 - trespass to chattels, 742
 - types of, 573-577
 - wrongful death statutes, 574, 579-583
 - Dams, 643-646
 - De minimis non curat lex*, 36, 37-38, 39
 - Deadly force
 - defense of habitation, 65, 66
 - defense of person, 65-66
 - defense of personal property, 71-72
 - Deceit. *See* Fraud and deceit
 - Defamation, 773-829
 - constitutional
 - private figures, involved in an issue of public concern, 814, 815-823
 - private figures, not involved in an issue of public concern, 814, 823-829

- public figures, 803-804, 810-814
 - public officials, 803-810
 - damages, 776, 785-786
 - "defamation-proof" defendants, 800
 - "defamatory" statements
 - opinions, 789-794
 - what are, 778-789
 - elements of, 774-776
 - employer-privileged communications, 787, 800-802
 - fault requirements, 776, 787. *See also*
 - constitutional, *above*
 - First Amendment, 804
 - Internet publication, 777
 - malice
 - "absolute," 801-802
 - actual, 802, 803, 805, 806-811, 819-822
 - express *versus* actual, 802
 - qualified privilege, defeat of, 799, 800, 802
 - media defendants, 788-789
 - constitutional treatment of, 823. *See also*
 - constitutional, *above*
 - statutory treatment of, 826
 - opinions, 789-794
 - per se and per quod*, 778-786
 - privileges, 773
 - absolute, 794-795, 796-797, 801
 - employers, 787, 800-801
 - qualified, 795, 797-800, 801, 802
 - protected legal interest, 773
 - public figures, 802-804, 811-814
 - public officials, 802-811
 - publication requirement, 775-776
 - punitive damages, 776
 - self-publication, 776-777
 - single publication rule, 776, 777
 - statutory, 787-788
- Defense of others
- assault and battery, 62-66
 - force usable, 65-66
 - obligation to retreat, 67
 - perception of threat, 64-65
 - proportionality, 64
- Defense of property, 66-72
- deadly force, use of, 65, 66, 71-72
 - proportionality, 70-72
 - reasonable force, use of, 69-72
- Defenses
- assault
 - generally. *See* Assault
 - consent. *See* Consent
 - assumption of risk. *See* Assumption of risk
 - avoidable consequences doctrine, 335-341
 - battery
 - generally. *See* Battery
 - consent. *See* Consent
 - "coming to the nuisance" doctrine, 768-770, 770-771
 - comparative negligence. *See* Comparative negligence
 - contributory negligence. *See* Contributory negligence
 - immunities. *See* Immunities
 - "last clear chance" doctrine, 302-303, 308, 314-315
 - negligence
 - assumption of risk. *See* Assumption of risk
 - avoidable consequences doctrine, 335-341
 - comparative negligence. *See* Comparative negligence
 - contributory negligence. *See* Contributory negligence
 - generally. *See* Negligence
 - immunities. *See* Immunities
 - "last clear chance" doctrine, 302-303, 309, 314-315
 - statutes of limitation. *See* Statutes of limitation
 - statutes of repose. *See* Statutes of repose
 - privileges
 - defamation. *See* Defamation
 - trespass. *See* Trespass to land
 - products liability claims
 - regulatory/statutory compliance, 722-727
 - "state of the art" defense, 696-698
 - statutes of limitation. *See* Statutes of limitation
 - statutes of repose. *See* Statutes of repose
 - trespass to land, 742-751
 - Deterrence rationale, 8-14
 - Directed verdict, 3, 31
 - Disabled "reasonable person" standard, 119-123
 - Discovery rule, 206-208, 359-360
 - Diseases
 - medical professional's duty to protect third parties from, 525-528
 - National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, 854-858
 - occupational diseases, proximate cause of, 246
 - Dismissal of action, 3, 46
 - Disturbing the peace, 58-59
 - landowners and occupiers, 233-235
 - Drugs, 703-710
 - Drunkenness. *See* Intoxication

- Earning capacity, loss of, 598-606
- Earnings, lost, 576-577, 596-598
- Economic damages, 595-596
- defamation actions, 785
 - earning capacity, loss of, 598-606
 - lost wages, 596-598
 - medical expenses, 576, 595, 596
 - "mere economic" harm, 543-552
- "Eggshell" plaintiffs, 255-259
- no-fault automobile insurance, 844-846
- Emotional distress
- intentional infliction of, 45-46, 72-88
 - child sexual misconduct, 84
 - exclaiming "Outrageousness!", 77-78
 - guarantee of genuineness, 98
 - intent, 75-76, 85-88
 - Native American, sports mascots, 93
 - outrageous conduct, 46, 73-87
 - persons in power, 75
 - plaintiff's particular sensitivity, 75
 - protected legal interest, 72
 - recklessness and, 82-83
 - severe emotional distress, 75-82
 - spousal relations, interference with, 75-77
 - transferred intent, 85-88
 - negligent infliction of, 528-544
 - bystander recovery, 532-542
 - contractual basis for, 542-543
 - emotional injury only, 534-535, 537
 - impact rule, 529-530, 532
 - physical manifestation of distress, 529-531, 536-537
 - property, loss of, 540-543
 - zone of danger rule, 532, 533, 535
 - reckless infliction of, 82-85
- Empirical view of torts, 4-8
- Employer liability
- for employee's intentional torts, 407
 - generally. *See Respondeat superior*
- Employer-privileged communications, 787, 800-801
- Enterprise risk theory, 407
- Environmental harms, 647
- Evidence
- burden of proof. *See Burden of proof*
 - circumstantial, 159, 161
 - emotional distress, severe, 77-80
 - negligence. *See Negligence*
 - professional standard of care, 420
 - punitive damages, 606-610
 - workers' compensation proceedings, 839-840
- Excessive force
- consent, vitiation of, 57-58
 - deadly force. *See Deadly force*
- Exemplary damages. *See Punitive damages*
- Expert testimony
- child's abilities, 115-116
 - emotional distress, severe, 78-81
 - legal malpractice claims, 452
 - medical malpractice cases, 434-438
 - product design defects, 696
 - res ipsa loquitur* doctrine, 170
- Factual theory of case, 17
- Federal Tort Claims Act, 326-327
- discretionary function exception, 342-347
- Firefighter's Rule, 514-518
- Fireworks displays, 648-651
- First Amendment, 804
- Foreseeability of harm. *See Negligence*
- Fraud and deceit
- consent to battery, 53
 - tolling of statutes of limitation, 350, 360-362, 364
- Fungible products, and market share liability, 211-212
- Gender, and the "reasonable person" standard, 92
- Goal(s) of torts, 8-14, 15
- Good Samaritan statutes, 506-513
- Governmental immunity, 341-342
- discretionary functions, 342-348
 - Federal Tort Claims Act, 341-342
 - discretionary function exception, 342-347
 - political subdivisions, 348-349
- Guardian's liability, for minor's negligence, 119-121
- Health care professionals
- disease, duty to protect third parties from, 525-528
 - negligence. *See Medical malpractice*
- Hedonic damages, 589-590
- day-in-the life videos, 590-594
 - measurement of, 590-594
- Husband and wife
- consortium, loss of, 581
 - interference with marital relations, 75-78
 - interspousal immunity, 352-354
- Immunities
- apportionment of liability, 386-391

- attorney's judgmental immunity, 456
- Good Samaritans, 506-513
- intrafamily immunity, 348-358
- landlord immunity systems, 488-492
- sovereign immunity. *See* Governmental immunity
- Impact rule, 529-532
- Indemnity, 370
 - and *respondéat superior*, 401-402
 - inherently dangerous activities, 411
 - vicarious liability for, 407-411
- Inference of negligence. *See Res ipsa loquitur* doctrine
- Informed consent
 - to battery, 53
 - medical malpractice claims, 437-444
- Injunctions, against nuisances, 762-771
- Insanity. *See* Mental illness or insanity
- Insolvency, allocation of risk of, 397-399
- Intent
 - assault. *See* Assault
 - battery. *See* Battery
 - emotional distress, infliction of, 75-76
 - and insanity, 19-20
 - objective test of, 30
 - subjective test of, 30
 - transferred, 46-49
 - emotional distress, infliction of, 85-88
 - trespass to land, 729, 730-731, 733-734, 735
- Intentional torts, 1, 2, 15
 - assault. *See* Assault
 - battery. *See* Battery
 - emotional distress. *See* Emotional distress
 - employees, employer's liability for, 407
 - historical developments, 22-23
 - types of, 15
 - workers' compensation exclusion, 832-836
- Interspousal immunity, 352-354
- Intoxication
 - dramshop liability, 233-235
 - "reasonable person" standard, 122-123
 - social host liability, 233-235
- Intrafamily immunity, 352-358
- Joint and several liability, 206, 370-373
 - contribution under, 370, 374-376
 - damage threshold liability, 381-382
 - harm-based retention of, 382
 - jury comprehension of, 373-374
 - plaintiff's options under, 373
 - statutes, 381
- Judgment notwithstanding the verdict (N.O.V.), 4, 27
- Judgments, 4
 - as a matter of law, 3, 4, 27
 - notwithstanding the verdict (N.O.V.), 4, 27
 - summary, 3, 27, 39
- Judicial awards, research on, 6-7
- Jury awards
 - generally. *See* Damages
 - research on, 6-7
- Land
 - nuisance. *See* Nuisance
 - owners and occupiers. *See* Landowners and occupiers
 - trespass to. *See* Trespass to land
- Landlord liability, 488-492, 499-503
- Landowners and occupiers, 457-503
 - licensees and invitees, 467-475
 - alcoholic beverage liability, 233-235
 - characterization of, 467-470, 470-471
 - duty owed to, 467-468, 470, 471-475, 492-497, 497-498
 - elimination of distinction between, 492-497
 - first aid for, duty to provide, 506-510
 - "natural accumulations" rule, 480-483
 - negligence standard of care, 492-496, 497, 498
 - slip-and-fall cases. *See* Slip-and-fall cases
 - third-party criminal conduct, 483-491, 492
 - tenants and their guests, 488-492, 499-503
 - three-category system, rejection of, 492-499
 - trespassers, 457-467
- "Last clear chance" doctrine, 309
 - comparative negligence, 315
 - contributory negligence, 314
 - in modern practice, 315
- Legal malpractice, 449-456
 - damages, 453-456
 - elements of, 452
 - expert testimony, 453
 - judgmental immunity, 456
 - standard of care, 450-453
 - statutes of limitation, 366
 - statutes of repose, 367
- Legal realism, 8-9
- Legal sources, 17-18
- Legal theory of case, 17
- Liability waivers, 318-330
- Libel. *See* Defamation
- Life-prolonging procedures, withholding or withdrawing of, 290-291
- Limitation of actions. *See* Statutes of limitation

- Litigation
 alternatives to. *See* Litigation alternatives
 anecdotal evidence of, 4-8
 stages of, 2-4
- Litigation alternatives, 831-859
 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act,
 854-858
 no-fault automobile insurance, 842-854
 September 11th Victim Compensation
 Fund of 2001, 854-855
 workers' compensation statutes, 831-842
- Lost wages, 576-577, 596-598
- Malice. *See* Defamation
- Market share liability, 201-212
- Married persons. *See* Husband and wife
- Medical expenses, 576, 595, 596
- Medical malpractice
 damage "caps," 623-631
 damages
 "caps" on, 623-631
 "loss of chance" cases, 215-216
 defendant identification, 445-449
 expert testimony, 434-438
 Good Samaritan statutes, 510-513
 increased risk of eventual harm, 212-213,
 214, 216, 219
 informed consent claims, 438-444
 lost chance of recovery, 212-216
 minors, limitation of actions by, 365
 "no-fault" proposals, 853
res ipsa loquitur doctrine, 434-437, 445,
 446-449
 research studies, 5-6
 standard of care
 customary practice, 417-420, 425, 426
 expert testimony, necessity of, 434-438
 geographic scope of, 431-434
 as to informed consent, 438-444
 "reasonably competent practitioner"
 standard, 421-426
 "schools of thought," 425-426
 statutes of repose, 365
 treatment of plaintiff's injury, 274-280
 "wrongful birth/life," 553-560
- Medical professionals
 disease, duty to protect third parties from,
 525-528
 negligence. *See* Medical malpractice
- Mental disability
 battery action, defense to, 31-35
 "reasonable person" standard, 119, 123-127
 statutes of limitation, 206, 365, 366
- Mental illness or insanity
 battery, defense to, 19-20
 psychiatrist's duty to protect third parties
 from criminal attacks, 518-525
- Minors
 attractive nuisance doctrine, 460-466
 comparative negligence of, 117
 liability waivers, 317-321, 324-326
 medical malpractice claims, time limitation
 for, 365
 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act,
 854-858
 negligence of
 comparative negligence, 117
 custodial liability, 117-119
 "Illinois rule," 116-117
 standard of care, 111-117
 parental consortium, loss of, 580-581
 parental immunity doctrine, 344,
 354-358, 359
 statutes of limitation, 206, 365, 366
 "wrongful birth/life" claims, 553-560
- Mistake
 consent to battery, 53
 trespass to land, 734
- Model jury instructions, 114
- Modified alternative liability theory, 201-212
- Motor vehicle no-fault insurance, 842-854
- Motor vehicle owners' vicarious liability,
 412-415
- National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act,
 854-858
- "Natural accumulations" rule, 480-483
- Negligence, 1, 2, 15
 alternative liability theory, 193-201,
 201-205
 burden of proof, 208
 modified alternative liability, 201-212
 animal injuries, liability for, 633, 634,
 639-641
 apportionment of liability, 206, 315-316
 comparative negligence, 302-303
 assumption of risk. *See* Assumption of risk
 avoidable consequences doctrine, 320-326
 breach of duty, 135-171
 industry custom, violation(s) of,
 152-159
 proof of, 135
 statutory violation(s), 136-152
 burden of proof, 173-174
 alternative liability cases, 208
 causation, 175, 176, 177, 182, 183, 184,
 276-277
 increased risk of harm, 219

- where multiple sufficient causes exist, 181, 182
- proximate cause, 276-277
- but-for causation, 174-180
 - alternatives to, 174-219
 - multi-party cases, 236
- causation, 173-219
 - alternative liability, 193-203, 199-200, 202
 - burden of proof, 175, 183-184, 276-279
 - but-for test, 174-180, 187
 - but-for test alternatives, 180-219
 - concert of action, 188-193, 202, 205-206
 - defendant's conduct-plaintiff's harm connection, 173
 - factors relevant to, 227
 - increased risk of eventual harm, 212-213, 214, 216-219
 - intervening causes, 277-290
 - lost chance of recovery, 212-216
 - market share liability, 201-212
 - moral role of, 180
 - multiple sufficient causes, 177, 181-189
 - preemptive causes, 188-189
 - proximate cause. *See* proximate cause, *below*
 - statutory violation(s), 138-139
 - "substantial factor" test, 242, 263-265, 264-271, 272-274
 - superseding causes, 277-290
 - terminology, 173
 - toxic substances, injuries from, 177-178
- comparative. *See* Comparative negligence
- concerted action theory, 188-192, 202, 205-206
- contributory. *See* Contributory negligence
- costs-benefits analysis, 97-101
- dangerous instrumentalities, 100-104
 - and the child standard of care, 111-114
- defenses, 293-367
 - assumption of risk. *See* Assumption of risk
 - avoidable consequences doctrine, 335-341
 - comparative negligence. *See* Comparative negligence
 - contributory negligence. *See* Contributory negligence
 - Contributory negligence
 - immunities. *See* Immunities
 - "last clear chance" doctrine, 308, 314-315
 - statutes of limitation. *See* Statutes of limitation
 - statutes of repose. *See* Statutes of repose
- duty, 228-241
 - breach of. *See* breach of duty, *above*
 - criminal trespassers, landowner's duty to, 458-460
 - foreseeability of harm, 227, 228, 240, 241, 251
 - invitees, landowners' duty to, 465, 467-468, 492-496, 497, 498
 - licensees, landowners' duty to, 465, 467, 468, 470, 492-496, 495, 497, 498
 - medical professional's duty to protect third parties, from disease, 525-528
 - psychiatrist's duty to protect third parties, from criminal attacks, 518-525
 - as a question of law, 228
 - recognition of, 221, 222-224, 227, 238-241
 - to rescue or protect, 505-528
 - role of, 221-227
 - of school counselors to suicidal students, 235-240
 - of social hosts who provide alcohol, 233-235
 - "special relationships," 226-227, 231, 232-233
 - special rules, 505-572
 - standard of care. *See* standard of care, *below*
 - "economic" harm, liability for, 543-553
 - "eggshell" plaintiffs, 255-259
 - elements of, 89
 - emergency situations, 104-107
 - emotional distress. *See* Emotional distress
 - evidence
 - breach of duty, 135
 - professional standard of care, 420
 - statutory violation(s), 139-143, 150-151, 151-152
 - foreseeability of harm
 - application difficulties, 259-264
 - criminal third-party conduct, 482-488
 - direct cause and, 238, 239
 - duty and, 227, 228, 229, 230, 244, 251
 - "eggshell" plaintiffs, 255-259
 - emotional distress, bystander recovery for, 533-535, 536
 - intervening acts, 273, 279, 281, 282, 288
 - medical malpractice, 289-290
 - proximate cause and, 240-256, 242, 247-264
 - "substantial factor" test and, 272-274
 - trespass to land, 735
 - unusual accidents, 247-255
 - Hand formula/test, 96-97, 99, 101
 - industry custom and, 152-153

- immunities. *See* Immunities
- industry custom, violation(s) of, 153-159
- inference of. *See Res ipsa loquitur* doctrine
- intervening causes, 277-291
- joint and several liability, 205-206, 356-362, 370-376
- jury's role, 90
- reasonable person test, 112-113
- statutory violation(s), 138
- knowledge
- of risks, 93-95
- superior, 107-110
- "last clear chance" doctrine, 308, 314-315
- market share liability, 200-212
- medical professionals. *See* Medical malpractice
- mentally disabled, 119, 123-128
- minors
- comparative negligence, 117
- custodial liability, 117-119
- "Illinois rule," 116-117
- standard of care, 111-117
- parental liability, 117-119, 119-121
- per se*. *See* statutory violation(s), *below*
- physically disabled, 117-123
- physicians. *See* Medical malpractice
- products liability: claims, 655-659, 660, 667
- professionals
- generally. *See* Professional malpractice
- attorneys. *See* Legal malpractice
- medical. *See* Medical malpractice
- proximate cause, 221, 224-227, 235-281, 242-291
- burden of proof, 276-277
- combining approaches to determine, 271-277
- "continuous" forces, 266
- directness test, 236-239, 242, 243-246, 274, 283
- foreseeability test, 240-256, 242, 247-264
- intervening causes, 277-291
- jury instructions on, 274-276
- as jury question, 242
- lapse of time and, 266-267
- necessity of, 246-247
- occupational diseases, 246
- requirement of, 242
- role of, 221-227
- special rules for special circumstances, 246
- "substantial factor" test, 242, 256-262, 264-271
- superseding causes, 268-281, 277-291
- "reasonable person" standard, 90-99
- actor's knowledge and skill, 107-110
- costs-benefits analysis, 95-99
- dangerous instrumentalities, 100-104
- emergency situations, 104-107, 106-109
- juror discretion, 110-111
- knowledge of risks, 93-95, 107-112
- mentally disabled, 119, 123-128, 125-130
- minors, 113-119, 110-117
- physically disabled, 119-123, 121-125
- for professionals, 421-426
- res ipsa loquitur*. *See Res ipsa loquitur* doctrine
- several liability, 206, 362-373, 370, 376-385
- social costs-benefits analysis, 98
- standard of care, 89-90. *See also* "reasonable person" standard, *above*
- to licensees and invitees, 492-496, 494, 495, 497, 498
- for medical professionals. *See* Medical malpractice
- for professionals. *See* Professional malpractice
- statutes of limitation. *See* Statutes of limitation
- statutes of repose. *See* Statutes of repose
- statutory violation(s), 136-153
- applicability/interpretation of statute, 140-141, 142-143, 144-147
- causation, 138-139
- excuses, 149-151
- jury's role, 138
- licensing statutes, 143-144
- proof of negligence, 139-143, 150, 151-152
- rationale for using statutory standards, 142
- specificity required, 142
- without fault, 150
- sudden emergencies, 104-107
- superior knowledge and skill, 107-110
- superseding causes, 277-291
- trespass to land, 734
- unavoidable accident, 93
- Negligence *per se*. *See* Negligence, *subheading* statutory violation(s)
- No-fault automobile insurance, 842-854
- "causal connection" test, 849-852
- "permanent loss of use" exception, 847-848
- "thin skull" plaintiffs, 844-846
- Nominal damages, 36, 38
- Nuisance, 751-760

- “coming to the nuisance” doctrine, 768-769, 770
- damages, in lieu of injunction, 762-766
- (in)junctions against, 762-771
 - per se*, 760-761
 - private, 751-754, 755-756, 759-760, 761, 767
 - prostitution houses, 760
 - public, 751, 754-760, 761, 767
 - smoking in public areas, 759, 760
 - and trespass, 751, 758, 760
- Occupational diseases, proximate cause of, 246
- “Open and obvious danger” rule, 480-483
- Outrageous conduct, 46, 73-87. *See also*
 - Emotional distress
- Pain and suffering. *See* Damages
- Parents
 - child liability waivers, 324-325
 - child’s negligence, liability for, 117-119
 - intrafamily immunity, 344, 354-359
- Parties, 17
- Per se and per quod* defamation, 778-786
- Per se* negligence. *See* Negligence, subheading statutory violation(s)
- Per se* nuisance, 760-761
- Personal property
 - conversion of, 738
 - trespass to, 736-738, 741-742
- Pets, injuries from, 633-635, 639-641
- Physically disabled “reasonable person” standard, 119-123
- Physician malpractice. *See* Medical malpractice
- Pleadings, 17
- Political subdivision immunity, 348-349
- Pregnancy, wrongful, 553-560
- Premises liability. *See* Landowners and occupiers
- Primary implied assumption of risk, 326, 334, 560
 - baseball fans, 567-572
 - skiers, 560-566
- Privileges
 - defamation. *See* Defamation
 - trespass. *See* Trespass to land
- Products liability, 655-727
 - breach of warranty claims, 660-667, 685-689, 687-691
 - “deep pocket” theory, 686
 - defenses
 - regulatory/statutory compliance, 722-727
 - “state of the art” defense, 696-697
 - design defects, 667, 678-698
 - breach of warranty, 687-691
 - choosing among tests for, 697-698
 - “consumer expectations” test, 678-682, 686, 687-691, 697
 - expert testimony, 696
 - feasible alternative design, proof of, 690-697
 - generically unsafe products, 695-696
 - “risk-utility” test, 679, 682-687, 687-691
 - drugs, 703-710
 - early developments, 660-667
 - generically unsafe products, 695-696
 - manufacturing defects, 667, 668-678
 - market share liability theory, 201-212
 - negligence claims, 655-659, 658, 665
 - plaintiff’s carelessness or misuse of product, 709-722
 - regulatory/statutory compliance, 722-727
 - res ipsa loquitur* doctrine, 660
 - Restatements (Second) and Third*, 667-669
 - “risk spreading” theory, 686
 - “state of the art” defense, 696-697
 - statutes of limitation, 366
 - statutes of repose, 367
 - strict liability justifications, 668
 - warnings and instructions, 698-703
- Professional malpractice
 - attorneys. *See* Legal malpractice
 - medical professionals. *See* Medical malpractice
 - standard of care
 - customary practice standard, 414, 417-420, 425, 426
 - “reasonably competent practitioner” standard, 421-426
 - “schools of thought,” 425-426
 - to whom applicable, 426-430
- Professionals
 - negligence. *See* Professional malpractice
 - who are, 426-430
- Prostitution house, as nuisance, 761
- Proximate cause. *See* Negligence
- Public figure(s) defamation, 803-804, 811-814
- Public official(s) defamation, 803-811
- Punitive damages, 606-618
 - apportionment of compensatory and, 396
 - defamation, 776
 - defined, 36
 - excessiveness of awards, 610-618
 - proof required, 606-610
 - purpose(s) of, 573, 606
 - trespass to chattels, 742
- Purpose(s) of torts, 8-14, 15

- Rationale(s) for tort system, 8-14, 15
- Real property
 nuisance. *See* Nuisance
 owners and occupiers. *See* Landowners and occupiers
 trespass to. *See* Trespass to land
- Reckless conduct, 2, 15, 128-135
 balancing negligent and, 316
 comparative negligence, 304-305, 311-314, 315-316
 contributory negligence, 309-311
 degree of risk, 131
 emotional distress, infliction of, 82-84
 knowledge of risk, 134
 statutes, 315-316
 trespass to land, 734
- Recreational use statute(s), 131
- Releases of liability, 317-330
- Remittitur*, 576-578
- Res ipsa loquitur* doctrine, 159-170
 elements of, 161-162, 164-166
 expert testimony, 170
 medical malpractice claims, 434-437, 445, 446-449
 plaintiff's contributory negligence, 165-166
 products liability, 659
 statistical likelihood of negligence, 170
 waiver of doctrine of, 167-170
- Rescue doctrine, 510, 514-518
- Rescue, duty to, 505-513
- Respondeat superior*, 397-411
 contribution and, 401
 elements of, 400-401
 enterprise risk theory, 407
 indemnification and, 401-402
 independent contractors, 407-411
 negligent supervision, 400, 401
 rationale for, 402
 scope of employment, 402-406
- Restatements of Torts*, 18
- Seat belt non-use, 336-341
- Self-defense
 assault and battery, 59-62
 force usable, 65-66
 obligation to retreat, 66
 perception of threat, 63-65
 proportionality, 63
 and consent, 57
- September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, 858-859
- Several liability, 206, 356, 362-373, 370
 alternative liability theory, 382-384
 applying, effect of, 380-381
 concerted action and, 384-385
 damage threshold liability, 382
 "divisible" injuries, 379-380
 fairness and, 385
 fault threshold liability, 369
 "indivisible" injuries, 366, 377-379, 380
- Severe emotional distress, 78-83
 evidence of, 78
 factual showings of, 81-82
Restatement definition, 81
- Slander. *See* Defamation
- Slip-and-fall cases
 landlord's liability, 488-491, 499-503
- Smoking in public areas, as nuisance, 760
- Social guests. *See* Landowners and occupiers, *subheading* licensees and invitees
- Sovereign immunity. *See* Governmental immunity
- Special damages. *See* Damages
- Spouses. *See* Husband and wife
- Statutes of limitation, 206
 defined, 358
 discovery rule, 207-208, 359-360
 legal malpractice, 366
 medical malpractice actions by minors, 365
 mental disability, 206, 352, 365, 366
 minors, 206, 351, 352, 365, 366
 products liability, 366
 running of, 364
 single cause of action rule, 219
 with statutes of repose, combined effect of, 366, 367
 tolling of
 for disabilities, 366
 for fraudulent concealment, 350, 360-362, 364
- Statutes of repose
 defined, 358
 legal malpractice, 367
 medical malpractice, 365
 negligent construction and design, 348-350, 362-364, 365
 products liability, 367
 running of, 364
 with statutes of limitation, combined effect of, 353, 366, 367
- Strict liability, 1, 633-654
 for abnormally dangerous activities.
See Abnormally dangerous activities
 for animal injuries. *See* Animal injuries
 where negligence theories fail, 654
 for non-reciprocal risks, 647-648
 for product-related injuries. *See* Products liability

- Structured settlements, 605-606
- Subrogation, 145
- Summary judgment, 3, 27, 39
- Survival statutes, 574, 579-583
- Tenants and guests, landowners' liability to, 488-492, 499-503
- "Thin skull" plaintiffs, 255-259
no-fault automobile insurance, 844-846
- Transferred intent, 46-49
emotional distress, infliction of, 85-88
- Trespassing animals, strict liability for, 639-642
- Trespass to chattels, 736-738, 739-740, 741-742
- Trespass to land, 729-750
act requirement, 729, 733-734, 735
attractive nuisance doctrine, 460-466
child trespassers, 460-466
criminal trespassers, 458-460
discovered or frequent trespassers, 460
duty owed to trespassers
child trespassers, 460-466
criminal trespassers, 458-460
discovered, frequent or tolerated trespassers, 460
ejection of trespassers, 69-71
historical foundation, 735
intent requirement, 729, 730-731, 733-734, 735
invisible particles and intangibles, 734-735
landowner's death, liability for, 732-733
limited liability to trespassers, rationale for, 466-468
mistaken trespass, 734
negligent trespass, 734
and nuisance, 751, 760
privilege of necessity, 742-751
as a liability rule, 750
moral view of, 750-751
private necessity, 743-745, 751
public necessity, 745-750
protected legal interest, 729
reckless trespass, 734
tolerated trespassers, 460
trespassers, 457-467
- Unintentional harms, 89
negligence. *See* Negligence
recklessness. *See* Reckless conduct
strict liability. *See* Strict liability
- Vicarious liability, 399-415
respondeat superior. *See* *Respondeat superior*
of vehicle owners, 411-415
- Waivers of liability, 318-330
- Wantonness. *See* Reckless conduct
- Workers' compensation, 831-842
evidentiary rules, 840
injury "arising out of" employment, 836-840
intentional torts exclusion, 832-836
reformation of, 840-842
schedule(s) of compensation, 840-841
"Wrongful birth/life," 553-560
- Wrongful death statutes, 574, 579-583
- Zone of danger rule, 532, 533, 535