

# INDEX

- DEFECTIVE PRODUCTS OR BUILDING STRUCTURES
- dangerous defects, 185-194
  - accident-caused or calamitous damage, 185, 186-187, 190
  - accident-caused damage to product itself, 186-187
  - collateral damage to persons or other property, 186-187
  - case for dangerous defect exception, 186
  - Canadian courts, 188-193
    - contractor liable in negligence to non-privity party for dangerous defects, 189-190, 192-193
    - divergence of opinions, 189
    - product defect loss able to be claimed in contract, not tort, 188
    - recovery for dangerous defects, 187-188, 189-190
    - recovery for non-dangerous defects being open to question, 185, 187-190
  - defective chattel posing risk to other chattels without being dangerous, where, 192-193
  - economic loss vs. direct property damage, 189-192
    - defects manifested before accident, 191
    - imminent risk of physical damage, 186-188
  - English courts not allowing recovery, 187
  - imminent risk test, 191-194
    - damage to property itself vs. risk of damage to persons and other property, 192
    - contractual allocation of risk, 192
    - whether tort law ought to change allocation of risk, 192-193
    - marginal deterrence impact of negligence law, 193-194
  - “innocent” seller, strict liability of, 193-194
  - insurance rationale, 194
  - personal injury and direct suits
    - against manufacturer, 185-186
  - property damage and direct suits
    - against manufacturer, 186-187
  - statutory sales law, border line of, 185
- duty to warn, 204-207
  - dangerous defects, 204-206
    - cost of repairs not recovered, 205, 206
    - recovery of loss of profits during down time, 204, 205
  - economic loss cases, 204-207
  - owner’s claim in negligence succeeding against manufacturer, 204-205
  - knowledge imbalance, 206
  - reasonable reliance of consumer on manufacturer, 206
  - impractical to extend recovery for relational loss, 206
  - premise of duty ought to control its ambit, 206
  - relational claimants, 206-207
  - relational interests to product at issue, 206
- introduction, 173-180
  - accident-based property damage, 179-180
  - buyers’ claims against non-privity sellers, 173
  - Commonwealth having no single rule, 176-177

- defects in structures on real property, 175
- product defect loss, recovery for, 177-178
- “complex structure theory”, 179
- dangerous structural defects, 176-180
  - “complex structure theory”, 179
  - “material physical damage”, 179-180
  - physical vs. economic loss, 180-181
- “direct” economic loss, 173
- economic loss in products liability, meaning of, 178-179
- “economic loss rule” in United States, 174-176
  - recovery not available for this type of loss, 175, 180
- “expectation loss” or “consequential” economic loss, 173
- special legislation dealing with consumer sales transactions, 173
- “standard” products liability cases, 174
- statutory sales laws, 173, 175
- tort recovery against non-privity manufacturer or builder, avenues of, 174
- no recovery in tort: majority position, 180-185
  - England, 180
    - “dangerous defect” or “imminent risk”, 180-181
    - no recovery for structural defect economic loss, 180, 181
  - United States, 181-184
    - contract law, arguments for leaving product defect claims to, 184
    - legislative regulation, high degree of, 183
    - sales and consumer fields, 183
  - recovery precluded for product defect economic loss, 180-183
    - reasons for denying tort recovery, 181-183
- shoddy products: those neither causing nor posing risk of causing physical harm, 194-204
  - American courts, 199, 201
    - manufacturer usually responsible for buyer’s quality expectations, 199
    - implied warranty of merchantability, 199
  - U.S. generally not allowing tort recovery for non-dangerous defects, 194
- Australia and New Zealand, 196
  - liability for non-dangerous defects clearly established, 196
  - residential housing market, 196
- Canadian position unclear, 195-196
  - negligence claims for non-dangerous defects ought to be denied, 195-196
  - three categories of cases, 195-196
- case for abandoning requirement of privity, 197-198
- consumer housing market, 203-204
  - caveat emptor* in real estate transactions, 204
  - New Zealand and Australia, 203-204
    - remote purchaser able to recover directly from builder in tort, 203
- sales law remedy not applicable in real property defects, 204
- consumer product market, 202-203
  - manufacturer to disclaim or limit liability, whether permitting, 202
  - special consumer protection statutes, 202
    - presumption that statutory remedy adequate, 202
- disclaimer or exemption clauses, 201-202
  - manufacturer vs. seller, 201-202

- whether manufacturer entitled to benefit of seller's disclaimer, 201
- efficient allocation of loss by contract, 198
- manufacturer ultimately liable
  - according to terms of contract, 198-202
  - loss distribution arguments, 200-201
    - arbitrary to treat economic loss as costs associated with manufacturer's business, 200
    - difficulty where manufacturer's and seller's obligations differing, 201
  - meaning of shoddy or defective products, 198-199
  - quality control better effected by parties to contract, 199
  - sellers not necessarily passive conduits, 198
  - social goals in permitting tort action, 197-199
  - statutory sales remedies, inadequacy of, 196-197
    - whether significance outweighing disadvantages from recognizing tort remedy, 196-197
- summary and conclusions, 207-208
- IMMUNITY *SEE* STATUTORY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES, LIABILITY OF
- NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION
  - contracting parties, misrepresentations between, 90-104
  - introduction, 90
  - post-contractual misrepresentation, 90-96
    - antecedent contractual relationship, significance of, 91-93
    - assumption of responsibility not depending on specific duties created by contract, 95
    - common law duty of care being independent of contract, 95
    - "independent tort" requirement, 92, 94, 95
    - representation contradicting term of contract, 93
      - false sense of security, 94
      - representation not actionable, 96
    - whether representation corresponding to or contradicting term of contract, 95
  - pre-contractual representations, 96-104
    - concurrently actionable in tort and actionable in contract, 96, 101-104
      - need for contracting parties to expressly address tortious liability, 101
      - test whether contract intending to limit or negate right to sue in tort, 101-102
    - contractual language modifying scope of duty in tort, 96, 100-101
    - option of suing in negligence or contract, differences in, 102-103
      - limitation period, 102, 103
      - measure of damages, 102, 103
    - representation independent of contractual provisions, 97-98
  - statement as negligent misrepresentation or term of contract, 97-101
    - assumption of responsibility approach, 99
    - contractual warranty, 97-98, 100
    - guarantee, finding of, 100-101

- special relationship, 99-100
- contributory negligence, 122-125
  - reasonable reliance vs. contributory negligence, 123-124
  - divisible loss, 124
  - “justifiable reliance” for duty, 124-125
  - “reasonable reliance” for contributory negligence, 124
- duty of care, 36-89
  - existence of duty: when law recognizing duty of care in speech, 43-89
  - common indicators of duty, 73-86
    - generally, 73
    - other indicia of duty, 79-86
      - course of defendant’s business, 81, 83
      - professional or special skill requirement, 81-86
      - caveat* as indicator, 83-84
      - criticism of approach, 84
      - holding out as willing and able to give such advice, 83-86
      - ordinarily providing such advice, 83
      - “special skill”, 82, 84-85
      - social occasion, 80-81
      - special request for advice, 79-80
      - special skill as indicator of voluntary assumption of responsibility, 84-86
    - pecuniary interest, 74-79
      - advantages, 78-79
  - disclamatory language, 62-73
    - affirmative defence, 63, 65
    - test of reasonableness, 63
    - American approach, 65-70
  - assumption of responsibility
    - approach, 68-69
    - contributory negligence, issue of, 67-68
    - duty issue, indifference to, 66-67
    - liability rule, 69
    - pecuniary interest in transaction, 65-67
    - privity issue, 67-68
    - reasonable reliance test, 68-69
    - whether paid to acquire information or advice, 69-70
  - assumption of responsibility approach, advantages of, 64-65, 66, 68
  - negligent act of issuing building permit, 70-74
  - reasonable reliance, 71
  - risk-spreading, 72-73
  - voluntary assumption of responsibility, 71-72
  - Unfair Contract Terms Act*, application of, 63-64
  - “without responsibility”, 62-64
  - words indicating that duty of care not assumed, 62-64

foreseeable reasonable reliance, 50-56

  - foreseeability as required link between plaintiff’s conduct and defendant’s duty, 56
  - foreseeability not sufficient foundation, 56
  - popularity of reliance as crucial element of duty analysis, 55-56
  - proximity, issue-specific definition of, 50-52
  - de facto* test for duty of care remaining foreseeability, 51, 52

- reasonable reliance not acceptable justification for liability, 50-52
  - concerns about
    - indeterminate liability, 52
- reasonable reliance not conclusive indicator of assumed responsibility, 56
- reliance as crucial element of duty analysis, 55-56
- reliance as necessary for claim to succeed, 55-56
  - whether reliance
    - objectively reasonable, 55-56
- rule constituting interference with expert's freedom of speech, 53-54
- test suffering from serious difficulties, 53-55
  - concept being inherently ambiguous, 53
  - information and advice as valuable commercial commodities, 54-55
  - liability where
    - appropriation against defendant's wishes, 54
  - reliance at plaintiff's own risk, 54
- introduction, 43-46
  - Canadian court approaches, 44-46
    - "foreseeable or known reasonable reliance", 44-46
    - "special relationship", 44
    - "voluntary assumption of responsibility", 44-46
  - duty of care in speech, 45
    - no single legal test governing recognition, 45
  - special relationship, 47-50
    - confusion with "fiduciary relationship", 49-50
    - doctrinal convenience, 49
    - label for lengthy list of factors, 48
    - particular relationships identified as "special" creating precedent, 47-48
      - difficulties in approach, 48
    - potentially indeterminate liability, problem of, 47
    - proximate relationship, 47, 49
      - need for some degree of proximity, 47
      - proximity-reasonable approach, 49
- voluntary assumption of responsibility, 57-62
  - assumption implied as matter of fact, 59-60
    - objective factors relied on by the court, 60
    - purpose of enquiry to determine defendant's actual intention, 60
  - assumption of responsibility test, 60-62
    - consensual transfer of commercial property, 60
    - focus on plaintiff's reasonable reliance, 60
    - focus on what duty ought to be owed, 61
  - contract law, resemblance to, 61-62
    - commercial setting drawing upon contract law, 61
    - criticism of Lord Devlin's approach, 62
    - "equivalent to contract", 62
  - key factor in recognition of duty of care, 56
  - meaning of approach, 57-58

- courts imposing duty of care on defendant, 59
- implying assumption of responsibility, 59
- defendant not expressly undertaking legal responsibility, 59
- inference of
  - assumption of responsibility being legal fiction, 58-59
  - legal liability ought to be imposed regardless of defendant's intentions, 59
  - where express and unambiguous undertaking, 58
  - whether indicators
    - convincing court to infer voluntary assumption, 59
- several relevant factors considered in supporting inference, 58-59
- professional responsibility cases, 62
- rationale in *Hedley Byrne* case as disclamatory language, 57
- preferred reasoning that no duty existing as no voluntary assumption, 57
- other considerations of duty of care, 85-87
- introduction, 36-38
  - existence of duty of care in tendering information or advice, 37, 38
  - extent of duty, 38, 39
- Hedley Byrne* decision and whether to recognize duty, 36
- indeterminacy issue, 37
- standard of care entailed by duty, 38
  - standard of reasonable care in circumstances, 38
- test for recognizing duty of care, 37, 38
  - assumption of responsibility, voluntary, 37, 38
  - "direct or indirect pecuniary interest test", 37, 38
  - reliance on information or advice, inferring, 38
  - "special relationship", 37
- special or restrictive duty of care, justification for, 39-43
- American vs. Commonwealth approach, 43
  - American action evolving from contract law principles, 43
  - pragmatic difficulty of indeterminate loss, 43
- Commonwealth courts
  - beginning with tort duty focus, 43
  - concern with basis of duty itself, 43
- commercial law principles being decisive, 42
  - tender documents and whether representation regarding permits, 42
- commercial setting in relation to financial loss, 39-40, 42
  - focus on circumstances under which loss inflicted, 39
- contractual aspects of action, 41
- indeterminate liability, potential for, 39, 43
- information and advice as valuable commercial products, 40
- negligence in speech, 40
- reliance on representation, 40-41
  - "reasonable" reliance and contributory negligence, 41
- summary and conclusions, 89
- historical development, 29-36

- American and Commonwealth differences, 34-36
  - misrepresentation as actionable wrong in United States, 34, 35
    - preoccupation with privity and contractual duty, 35
  - negligence as basis of liability in Commonwealth, 34-36
    - disadvantages of close connection to personal injury negligence law, 35
    - further extensions of negligence law to other economic loss claims, 35-36
- Commonwealth courts refusing to recognize cause of action prior to 1963, 31-32
  - Derry v. Peek* decision and need for proof of fraud, 30-31
  - refusal to recognize duty to third parties for negligent statement or survey, 30, 31
  - Hedley Byrne* decision recognizing negligent misrepresentation action, 31-33
    - facts of case, 32
    - importance of decision in negligence law, 33
    - obiter dicta* speeches recognizing action, 32-34
      - Derry v. Peek* decision not precluding action in negligence, 33
      - Gordon's criticisms of doctrinal distortions, 33
  - law of contract being main avenue of recovery, 29-30
    - close relationship with law of negligent misrepresentation, 30
  - recovery of economic loss developing separately until 1960s, 29
  - tort recovery limited, 29
- introduction, 27-28
  - cause of action first recognized in *Hedley Byrne* decision, 27
  - commercial context, 27
  - contract law, modification to traditional, 27
  - contractual setting remaining problematic, 28
  - contributory negligence, defence of, 28
  - duty of care, recognition of, 27-28
    - assumption of responsibility for statement, 28
    - reliance, foreseeable reasonable, 28
    - "special relationship", 28
  - purpose rule and indeterminate liability, 28
- liability to whom and for what loss, 104-122
  - end and aim rule, 106-110
    - Commonwealth approach, 109
    - end and aim of representation, 108-110
    - "known limited class", plaintiff as member of, 108
    - "known use" limit or "end and aim" rule, 108-109
    - transaction-specific tort, 105-106, 107
  - exceptional profession-specific approach, 110-114
    - accounting liability, 112-114
      - spreading losses, 113
    - audited accounts and takeover bid, 110-113
      - foreseeability test, 110, 111
      - indeterminate liability, 111
        - whether defendants ought to have known that accounts relied on, 110, 111
    - professional regulation, realm of, 112
      - accounting profession, 112-113
        - materiality, 55-56
  - indeterminate amount, beyond problem of, 114-121

- cause of action arising from
    - breach of abstractor's contractual duty, 117-118
    - foreseeable class of potential injured persons, 118
    - foreseeable plaintiff test, appropriateness of, 119-121, 122
    - whether foreseeability being sufficient justification, 120-121
  - persons that defendant never intended to rely on his or her information, 115-116
  - insufficient relationship between parties, 116
  - potentially indeterminate time, 118-119
  - relational test derived by reference to contemplated transaction, 120-121
  - "substantially similar" transactions, 114-117, 121
  - limiting amount of liability, 121
  - question of amount of risk, 114-115
  - where no potential problem of indeterminate liability, 115
  - introduction, 104-106
    - double foreseeability test not working, 104
    - indeterminate liability, 105
    - summary, 122
  - quantification of damages, 125-128
  - "expectation" measure, 125-126
  - "loss of capital" approach, 126
  - negligent property valuation, 126-127
    - duty to provide information vs. duty to advise someone, 126-127
  - "reliance loss", 126-127
  - tortfeasor not liable for losses occurring even if information correct, 127
  - damages flowing naturally from breach of duty, 127
- NEGLIGENT PERFORMANCE OF SERVICE
- additional duties derived from defendant's contract with third party, imposition of, 154-160
  - analogy to cases involving claims for relational loss consequent on damage, 159-160
  - assumption of responsibility for accuracy of its bid, 156
  - cause of action for negligent interference with prospective economic advantage, 156-158
  - exclusionary rule, disapproval of, 157
  - focus on nexus between defendant's conduct and plaintiff's injury, 157
  - landlord having separate interest and plaintiff not third party beneficiary, 157
  - defendant engaged to perform roadway improvements, 158-159
    - merchants vitally interested in ways specifically foreseeable, 158
  - exclusionary rule, 158-160
    - exception where special relationship, 158-159
    - exception where type of harm specifically contemplated, 159
    - exceptions, other, 159-160
  - extension of benefit of contractual arrangement, 156-157
  - extension of liability beyond immediate end and aim of contract, 154
  - power of architect carrying commensurate legal responsibility, 154-155
  - powerful relational claim, 155
  - survey of vessel being negligent, 155-156
    - absence of assumption of responsibility, 155-156
    - contractual regime for loss allocation, 155



- affirmative action, imposition of duties of, 160-172
  - comparative negligence solution, 165-167
  - degree of caution to be considered when imposing affirmative obligations, 165-166
  - duty not owed to warn that policy not renewed where no erroneous information given, 166-167
  - no long-standing pattern of behaviour, 167
  - duty to warn of economic risks, 169
  - duty to warn user about dangerous product defects, 167-168
    - risk of physical harm as source of duty of care, 168
    - voluntary undertaking, 168
  - failure to warn about soil conditions, 169
    - duty owed based on relationship, 169
  - general duty to take affirmative action not recognized, 161
  - independent duty of care breached, 170-171
    - defendants in position to predict probability and severity of risk, 170
    - efficiency arguments, 171
    - “intent to benefit plaintiff” test distorted, 171
    - relationship sufficiently close to justify imposition of duty of affirmative action, 171
  - misfeasance, actionable, 154
  - nonfeasance, 154
  - past conduct creating self-imposed duty in law, 165-166
  - reliance on defendant to perform act for his benefit, 160-161
  - relationship of professional adviser, and defendants holding out as experts, 163-165
    - defendants assuming duty to advise plaintiff, 165
    - duty imposed commensurate with relationship, 164
  - restriction to cases where pre-existing serious business relationship, 161-162
    - “special relationship”, 162
  - Restatement of Torts, Second*: pre-contractual business relationship, 162-163
    - exceptional decision, 164
    - non-disclosure liability for, 162-163
      - special character of trust and confidence, 163-164
    - voluntarily entering into business relationship, 165
      - court imposing corresponding obligations, 165
- direct undertakings to perform specific service, 130-136
  - actions in contract, resemblance to, 132
  - Commonwealth courts, 133-134
    - contractual basis for action, 134-135, 153-154
    - negligence action, 135
    - new substantive rights, creating, 133
  - concurrent liability in tort and contract, 132-133, 136
    - guarantee of performance, where, 136
  - distinguishing service cases, 132
  - necessary conditions, 130-131
  - nonfeasance of gratuitous promise not actionable in tort, 132-133
  - similarity between negligence action and action in contract, 132-134
    - essential elements of causes of action being similar, 134
    - questions raised, 134
  - voluntary undertaking to perform service, 131
- indirect undertakings to perform specific service, 136-154
  - incidental beneficiaries, 147-154
    - building construction projects, 147-151
    - chain contract cases, 148, 149

- owner recovering directly
    - from subcontractors, 147-150
    - limit on liability, 149-150
  - defective product or structure, 148
  - party to contract owing duty of care in tort to known third parties, 151-152
    - duty limited to intended primary beneficiary of supply contract, 152
  - supplier's breach of contract with general contractor, 150-153
    - additional benefit not bargained for in subcontract, 153
    - affirmative duties based on extremely close relationship, 151
    - negligence in performance of contractual duty, 151
    - representation concerning delivery date, whether, 150-151
  - introduction, 136-137
  - third party beneficiary or end and aim, 137-147
    - concurrent liability, 138-140
    - frustrated beneficiary cases, 140-143, 145
      - beneficiary as mere donee, 142-143
      - duty of care including duty to confer benefit on third party, 141
      - "end and aim" rule, 142
      - "implied representation", 140
      - inference that assumed responsibility, 141, 142
    - "intended beneficiary" test in contract, 137-140
    - non-privity beneficiary, 139
    - other cases, 145-147
      - beyond end and aim principle, 146
      - non-privity intended beneficiary, 145, 146
      - recovery permitted, 146
    - relevant factors, 138-139
      - deterrence rationale, 138, 139
    - reliance not necessary element in causal sequence, 141-142
    - restrictive view of end and aim approach, 143-144
      - lack of sufficient relationship of proximity, 144-145
      - "limited class" test, 144
      - potentially indeterminate liability, 144, 145
      - relational theory, 144, 145
      - undertaking to perform specific service, whether, 145
  - introduction, 129-130
    - defendant's undertaking, 129-130
    - pre-existing business relationship, where, 130
    - third party beneficiary of contract, 129-130
    - voluntary assumption of responsibility, 129, 130
- OVERVIEW**
- categories and categorization, 15-26
    - benefit of keeping misrepresentation cases and service cases separate, 18
    - case-by-case approach, 22-23
      - Perre* case, 23
    - categorical approach, 22, 24
    - categories corresponding to recognized types of claims, 16
    - defective product or structure category, 18
    - effectiveness of categories, 16-17
    - negligent misrepresentation category, 17
    - new categories, potential for, 24
      - emergent category, 24-25
    - normative justifications for grouping issues, 20-23
      - assumption of responsibility, 21
      - level of abstraction being too high, 19
      - "middle theory", 21

- negligence law deferring to existing contract, whether, 21-22
  - variables, 22
- public powers and duties, non-exercise of, 19-20
  - negligent public authority, difficulty in recovery from, 20
- recovery of economic loss
  - permitted in certain cases, 15-16
- relational loss category, 19
- services category, 17-18
- categorical approach, 1
  - examples of each category, 1
- Perry's view, pure economic loss, 8
- "pure economic loss", meaning of, 1
  - consequential economic loss, distinguished from, 1
- pure economic loss vs. physical damage, 7-15
  - contractual channelling of economic loss, 14
    - third party beneficiary, 14
  - exclusionary economic loss rules, whether justifying, 14-15
    - case for liability for economic loss, 14
  - personal injury not accompanying pure economic loss, 11-12
  - property loss accompanying personal injury, 11
  - "personality thesis", 11
  - presumption of liability, appropriateness of, 8-10
  - "presumptive liability" thesis, 7, 8, 13
    - Anns v. Merton* decision, 7, 8
    - rebuttable presumption, 8
  - products liability and relational loss cases not generally involving personal injury, 12
  - property loss accompanying personal injury, 11
  - pure economic loss not concerning personal injury, 12
  - qualitative difference in type of damage, 10
- remoteness, issue of, 13-14
  - "floodgates" argument, 13
  - practical distinction, 13
  - restrictive principles of recovery, 13-14
- social losses, 11-12
  - differences of degree, 11-12
  - summary, 15
- rules for recovery of economic loss, 3-7
  - Australia, 3, 4
    - relational loss, 4
  - Canada, 3-4
    - Anns* approach, 3-4
  - Commonwealth jurisdictions, 4, 5-7
    - distinct branch of negligence law, 4
    - exclusionary rule precluding recovery for relational economic loss, 5-6
    - Hedley Byrne* and misrepresentation field, 6-7
    - United States, 4-6
      - compared with, 6
      - contrasted with, 4-5
  - English House of Lords, 3
  - New Zealand, 3, 4
  - United States, 2-3, 4
    - Commonwealth vs. United States, 2-5
    - "economic loss rule", 5
      - exclusionary rule in products liability cases, 5
    - each category having separate history, 4-5
- PUBLIC AUTHORITIES *SEE* STATUTORY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES, LIABILITY OF
- RELATIONAL ECONOMIC LOSS
  - introduction, 209-216
    - American jurisdictions, 211-212
    - Australia and case-by-case approach, 215-216
    - Canadian courts, 211-215
      - case-by-case approach rejected, 215

- relational loss recognized as
  - category of claim for economic loss, 212-214
  - principles adopted by
    - Supreme Court of Canada, 215
- common law recognizing firm
  - exclusionary rule for relational loss, 211-212
  - loss consequent upon injury to third party, 211-212
  - pure economic loss, 212
- defendant's negligence causing
  - physical harm to third party, 209-210
  - physical damage negligence law, 210
  - plaintiff suffering economic loss because of relationship with injured third party, 210
- English courts, 212-213
- motor vehicle negligence case, example of, 210
- New Zealand position not clear, 215-216
- support of exclusionary rule, 216-235
  - general justification for exclusionary rule, 217-227
    - defendant unable to pay judgments, 222-224
    - losses shared with victims, 222-223
  - deterrence theory, 221-222
  - fault, concept of, 223-224
    - conduct not necessarily morally blameworthy, 223
  - foreseeable direct relational interest, 222-223
    - magnitude of losses being unpredictable, 222
  - impractical to adopt rule of liability, 226
  - insurance, commercial first-party, 224-227
  - potential plaintiffs increasing greatly, 226
- civil litigation process
  - extremely expensive, 226
- presumption that economic loss recoverable in same manner as physical damage, 216-217
- property damage and
  - consequential economic loss, resemblance of, 217-218
- protective options available for potential victim, 224-225
  - backup system, 225
  - commercial first-party insurance, 225
  - self-insurance, 224
- pure economic loss, 218, 220-221
  - built-in limiting factor being absent, 220
  - "out of proportion to fault", 220
  - no reason to justify exclusionary rule, 220-221
- recovery governed by concepts of duty, standard of care and remoteness, 219-220
- similarities not making case for allowing recovery for relational loss, 218-219
- possible alternatives to firm exclusionary rule, 227-235
  - incongruity between remedies available for different losses, 227
- three approaches, 227-235
  - general guidelines and judicial discretion, 230-235
    - advantage of approach, 230-231
  - Australian case and recovery by relational loss claimant, 232-233
  - broad jurisprudential layer, 232

- case-by-case approach, 230-233
  - practical argument, 233-234
    - judicial discretion
      - exercised within certain pre-existing rules, 234
    - proximity as governing concept, 230
    - relational loss layer, 232
    - specific exceptions, 228-229
    - specific limiting formulas, 229-230
- pure economic loss consequent on
  - personal injury, 273-276
    - classes of plaintiffs tending to pursue their claims, 273-276
    - close relatives dependent
      - financially on deceased or personally injured victim, 274
    - employers of workers killed or injured, 274-277
      - limitation to domestic servants rejected, 274
    - loss of employee's services in U.S., 275
    - loss of services of member of armed forces, 274
    - measure of damages, 274-275
    - per quod servitium* action, 223
    - relational loss of corporate owner/employer rejected, 275
    - insurers seeking to recover payments, 275-276
      - collateral source rule, 276
      - consequential on tortious injury or death of policy holder, 275-276
  - pure economic loss consequent on property damage, 235-273
    - contractual relational loss, 241-251
      - Australian decision, 246-250
        - complexity of problem, 249-250
      - policy factors, elusive, 249
    - pure economic loss, recovery of, 247-248
      - restrictive formula more limiting than
        - foreseeability, 248
        - means of knowledge, 248
      - tests inherently vague, 248-249
      - uncertainty inherent in case-by-case approach, 249
    - Canadian decision involving motor vehicle accident, 249-251
      - physical damage to road and cost of clean-up, 249-250
      - test for recovery of economic loss being *obiter dicta*, 250-251
    - introduction, 241-242
    - other relational claims, 246-251
      - contract not operating as effective limiting formula, 245
      - property damage vs. loss of contractual profits, 246, 247
      - physical damage as workable limiting factor, 247
      - status as owner vs.
        - independent status as real estate agent, 247
    - utility cases, 242-245
      - American cases, 243-244
      - Canadian cases, 244-245
        - "positive outlays", 245
      - English courts, 242-243
      - physical damage as effective limiting formula, 245
  - exceptions, 251-273
    - economic loss consequent on
      - damage to public resource, 267-273
      - defendant oil companies as best cost-avoider, 268
      - deterrence argument making overwhelming case for liability, 270

- extension of liability not creating increase in accident deterrence, 269-271
- foreseeability of injury being prime test, 268
- offshore waters as property belonging to those who use it, 270
- policy arguments understandable, 270
- public nuisance approach, 267, 271-272
  - “particular” or “special damage” suffered, 271-272
- pure economic loss, 267-268
- “special damage” test, 271-272
- general average claim, 252-254
- introduction, 251-252
- joint fishing ventures, 257-258
- joint venture exceptions, 258-261
  - indicia* of joint venture, 260-261
- possessory interest, 254-257
  - shipping chartering cases, 254-257
- transferred loss, 261-267
  - “collateral source rule” applied, 261-263
  - conclusions, 266-267
  - exclusionary rule rarely prejudicing insurer, 261-263
    - subrogation being derivative right and no greater than owner’s right, 262
    - tortfeasor’s liability limited by statute, 263
  - owner able to recover full value of damaged property, 261-262
  - owner allocating risk of loss to plaintiff by contract, 260-261
- property insurer’s right to legal subrogation, 261-262, 266-267
- recovery denied for negligent interference with contractual relations, 265-267
- where plaintiff having right to future possession of damaged property, 265-267
- where plaintiff under contractual obligation to bear loss directly, 263-265
  - buyer unable to recover value of damaged cargo as not having property, 264
  - seller not potentially liable for loss, 264-265
- carrier able to recover against tortfeasor, 264
- direct suit permitted where plaintiff having obligation to repair, 263-264
- owner of goods able to recover freight costs from tortfeasor, 260, 263-264
- non-contractual relational loss, 235-241
  - ascertainable class of particularly vulnerable plaintiffs, 235
  - criticism of exclusionary rule, 237-238
    - foreseeability principles, 237
  - denial of recovery where readily apparent practical difficulties, 236-238
  - foreseeability of loss or damage, 238-240
  - generally, 235
  - illustration of economic chain, 235-236

- impractical to allow every party who suffered foreseeable loss to recover, 235-236
  - practical grounds for limiting recovery, 239-241
  - significance of physical damage as limiting factor, 237-238
  - distinction between types of losses, 238
  - property physically damaged, 237
    - foreseeability test, uncertainty of, 237
  - pure economic loss claimants, 238-239
    - claims being too “remote and indirect”, 239
    - denial of claims justified on practical grounds, 239
- summary, 276-278
  - exceptions, 277-278
  - loss consequent upon damage to public resource, 277
  - pure economic loss vs. property damage, 276-277
  - ship chartering cases, 277
- SERVICE *SEE* NEGLIGENT PERFORMANCE OF SERVICE
- STATUTORY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES, LIABILITY OF
  - immunity principle and statutory powers, 290-312
    - Anns v. London Borough of Merton*, 290-292
    - duty where authority deciding to inspect, inspect, 291
      - bona fide* exercise of statutory discretion being immune from negligence law, 292
    - failing to inspect building foundation, 290-291
      - bona fide* decision to not exercise power being immune from negligence law, 291-292
    - duty to give “proper consideration” to question whether to inspect, 291
  - misfeasance vs. nonfeasance, 291
  - negligence in exercising statutory power, 290
  - “operational” powers and common law duty of care, 291
  - policy area and discretion, 290-291
  - policy vs. operational: drawing line, 296-312
  - conclusions, 311-312
  - distinction between immune policy decisions and operational negligence, 308-309
  - immunity for discretionary functions, 308-309
  - liability for negligent manner of warning, 308-309
  - undertaking to act from which standard of due care inferred, 308-309
  - functional approach to determining distinction, 310
  - policy-operational continuum, 310-311
  - whether finding of negligence requiring court to substitute its view, 310
  - operational negligence where review of functions not required, 311
  - residual discretion and reasonableness of exercise of discretion, 311
  - immunity not extending to something collateral to exercise of statutory power, 298-299
  - operating level vs. quasi-judicial level of municipality, 306-309

- discretionary functions,
  - immunity for, 306
- manner of exercising power
  - being matter of policy or planning, 305
- quasi-judicial functions
  - immunized from
  - negligence liability, 306
- “recognized rights of non-interference”, 306
- whether manner of inspection
  - at operational or policy level, 306-307
- police officer liability, 308-310
  - duty of care based on
    - statutory obligation to maintain traffic control, 309-310
    - affirmative duty imposed on police officers, 309
  - police occupying special position, 310-311
- private duties of care relevant in public authority cases, 299-310
  - duty in misrepresentation
    - based on voluntary assumption of responsibility, 299-301
    - collateral negligence, 300
    - distinguished from general exercise of statutory discretion, 301
    - discretionary decisions
      - not constituting simple misrepresentation claims, 301
  - duty of care independent of statute
    - empowering authority, 301
    - special relationship, 301
    - vicarious liability, 300
  - duty to exercise discretion in certain manner, 303-306
  - duty to exercise discretionary power
    - with reasonable care, 304
    - where authority
      - deciding to exercise discretionary power, 304-305
- frequency of inspection
  - being matter of discretion, 307
- private party voluntarily undertaking inspection, 304-305
  - duty to act with due care, 304-305
  - special relationship, 306-307
- residual discretion as to precise manner of inspection, 304-305
  - discretion delegated by legislation, 304
- undertaking of authority vs. undertaking of private party, 305
  - standard of care
    - differing vs. court-imposed standard of care, 305-306
- duty to perform gratuitous undertakings intended for plaintiff's benefit, 301-303
- failure to inspect building and discretionary planning function of authority, 302
  - duties of this nature
    - having no private party analogy, 302
- failure to inspect where builder giving notice, 302-303
  - application of private law principles, 302
  - private duty analogy problematic, 302-303



- 299
  - discretionary policy
    - choice, 303
    - practice of
      - inspecting
        - engendering
        - reasonable
        - reliance, 303
      - proof of reliance
        - difficult, 303
      - private cases based
        - on pre-existing business relationship, 303
    - failure to inspect where
      - builder not giving required notice, 302
      - whether negligent policy, 302
    - “public duty doctrine” in
      - United States, 307
      - liability based on duty to perform function
        - being owed to plaintiff, 307-308
      - “special relationship” test, 307
    - Smillie approach, 297-303
      - analogy to private party liability, 297-299
      - independently recognized rights of non-interference, 298
      - whether statutory authorization, 298
    - collateral approach, 298-299
    - common law duty by
      - reference to analogous case involving private parties, 298
      - private parties not conveying
        - discretionary public benefits, 298
    - discretionary policy decisions
      - as nuisance or negligence, 298-299
    - immunity not protecting
      - decisions involving professional choices, 296-298
    - immunity protecting
      - decisions of “policy” or “planning” nature, 296-297
    - public emergency power, 299
      - special factors taken into account at standard of care stage, 299
    - whether court substituting its judgment as to appropriate discretionary policy, 296
  - substantive rationale for immunity, 292-296
    - authority required to prove that act or omission resulting from policy choice, 295
    - court required to determine whether policy creating entitlement, 295-296
    - property-based approach, 296
  - courts being institutionally incompetent to exercise supervisory jurisdiction, 293
  - incoherence in speaking of standard of care in conveying gift, 294-295
  - claim of denial of public benefit not negligence approach, 295
  - political doctrine of Parliamentary supremacy, 293
- introduction, 279-290
  - economic loss claims, 282
    - public authority’s failure to confer benefit upon plaintiff, 282
  - economic loss issues, prominence of, 281
  - negligent inspection, 281
  - economic negligence claim and physical damage claim, 282-283

- same liability as private defendant, 282
  - vicarious liability for torts committed by employees, 282-283
- immunity for policy decisions, issue of, 284-285
  - Anns* decision and *bona fide* exercise of statutory discretion, 285
    - no immunity extending to improper exercise of discretion, 285
    - no immunity for acts and omissions collateral to exercise of power or duty, 285
    - no immunity for operational negligence, 285
  - Australian courts and more extensive immunity, 288-289
  - Canadian courts and scope of immunity, 285-286
  - English courts, 289
    - misfeasance, 289
    - nonfeasance of discretionary power, 289
  - extensive immunity, arguments for, 284
  - “general reliance”, liability based on, 286-289
  - New Zealand courts, 286-289
    - liability based on “general reliance”, 286-289
- legislation entailing both “policy-making” and “implementation” functions, 280-281
  - delegation of functions to authority, 280
  - functions delegated by discretionary language or mandatory language, 280-281
    - statutory powers vs. statutory duties, 280-281
- liability for omission depriving persons of benefits, 280-282
- purely financial losses, 281
- recognizing duty of care in public authority cases, 280
  - duty linked to mandatory obligations and discretionary powers, 280
- rules of recovery not distinguishing between physical and economic harm, 281
- “statutory public authority” defined, 279
- unique public authority duties of care, 283
- limits to immunity: liability for improper exercise of discretion, 329-338
  - action for deliberate or improper abuse of discretion, whether, 333-337
    - abuse of discretion exception to immunity, 336-337
    - discretionary decision to enforce by-law, 334-335
      - whether abuse of authority, 334-335
    - enacting by-law and enforcing it concerning operational duty, 334-337
    - enacting by-law vs. enforcing it, 336-337
      - discretion implying good faith in discharging public duty, 336
      - independent policy decision not to enforce by-law, 337
      - no duty to enforce by-law, 336-337
    - discretion exercised in good faith, where, 337-338
    - duty of good faith, 378
    - issue of negligence usurping discretion, 337-338
  - generally, 329-330
  - immunity not extending to improper exercises of discretion, 332-333
    - abuse of discretion, 333
  - Smillie’s approach, 331-332

- “special limited duty of reasonable care”, 331-332
  - two-stage test, 330-332
    - whether authority acted *ultra vires* or “outside any delegated discretion”, 330-331
- negligence and mandatory public duties, 312-315
  - misfeasance of mandatory public duty, 313-315
  - nonfeasance, 312-313
- proximity: alternative approach to same end, 315-329
  - bad faith* performance of regulatory duties, 325-328
    - bad faith* not limited to intentional misconduct, 327-328
  - common law required to impose duty of good faith, 327
  - delay in disbaring lawyer, 327
  - operational negligence not apparent, 326-327
  - public authorities required to perform functions in good faith, 327-328
    - where reckless indifference or gross carelessness, 326
- English courts, 323-324
- New Zealand courts, 323-324
- proximity test used to resolve negligence actions against public authorities, 315-319
  - actions for economic loss unsuccessful, 315-316
  - foreseeability of harm alone being sufficient to establish duty, 317-318
    - “special relationship” requirement, 317
  - proximate relationship between parties required, 316-317
- residual policy concerns considered in limiting or negating prima facie duty, 317
  - statute ought not to be construed as imposing specific duty, 317-318
- realm of legislative policy immune from negligence law, 327-329
  - failure to enact regulations in timely fashion, 327-328
  - no *ex ante* relationship between government and farmers, 327-329
    - whether breach of duty of good faith, 327-328
- statutory duty of care problematic, 317-322
  - fictional search for legislative intent, 318
  - foreseeable harm not sufficient to justification to impose affirmative obligations, 318
  - governments not “intending” by implication to create new source of liability, 318-319
  - legislation regulating general public interest, 318-319
    - private duty of care to investors undermining statutory regime, 319
  - professional regulatory bodies, 319-321, 325-327
    - legislatures not intending by implication to assume more liability, 320
  - sufficiency of relationship of proximity, 319-320
    - proximity between regulatory body and parties complaining, 319-320
- statutory schemes contemplating obligations to general public, 321-323
  - case where action should proceed against public authority, 322-323
  - operational negligence where inadvertent omission of clause, 323
  - specific assumption of responsibility, 323

358 / *Index*

sufficient proximity where  
specific class  
contemplated, 322-323

*ex ante* relationship not  
sufficient, 321-322  
private duty conflicting with  
public scheme, 321