Torts And Product Liability

Posted on October 17, 2019

Tort law provides civil remedies when one person's conduct wrongfully injures another. The original assignment asks a series of questions about negligence, negligence per se, causation, *res ipsa loquitur*, defenses, strict liability, and product liability. Those questions should remain the structure of the analysis because each addresses a distinct part of civil responsibility. The exact rule can vary by jurisdiction, and state statutes or appellate decisions may modify general common-law principles. The discussion below therefore explains widely recognized doctrines rather than offering advice for a particular lawsuit. A plaintiff ordinarily carries the burden of proving each required element by a preponderance of the evidence, meaning that the asserted fact is more likely than not to be true.

1. What Must a Plaintiff Prove to Establish Negligence?

A negligence claim generally requires proof of duty, breach, factual cause, legal or proximate cause, and damages. Some explanations combine the two forms of causation and describe four elements; others list five. The difference is organizational rather than substantive. A plaintiff cannot recover merely by showing that a defendant behaved carelessly in the abstract. The carelessness must violate a duty owed to the plaintiff, cause a legally recognized injury, and fall within the scope of responsibility that the law assigns to the defendant.

Duty of Care

Duty asks whether the defendant was legally required to use reasonable care toward the plaintiff. People generally have a duty to act as a reasonably prudent person would under similar circumstances when their conduct creates a foreseeable risk of physical harm. Special relationships, statutes, professional roles, property ownership, voluntary undertakings, and contractual arrangements can affect the existence and scope of duty. A physician's duty is evaluated under professional standards; a driver owes duties to other road users; and a manufacturer owes duties concerning reasonably foreseeable product users. Duty is often a legal question for the judge, although disputed facts may affect the analysis.

Breach

Breach occurs when the defendant fails to meet the applicable standard of care. The jury may consider the probability and seriousness of harm, the burden of precautions, customary practice, statutes, expert testimony, and the circumstances facing the defendant at the time. An accident does not automatically prove breach. Reasonable care does not require preventing every possible injury. The question is whether the defendant took precautions that a reasonably careful person or professional would have taken in light of the foreseeable risk.

Factual Cause

Factual cause asks whether the defendant's conduct actually contributed to the injury. The traditional "but-for" test asks whether the harm would have occurred but for the defendant's breach. If the answer is no, factual causation is ordinarily established. Some cases involve multiple sufficient causes, lost chances, toxic exposure, or several actors whose conduct combines. Courts may use substantial-factor language or other jurisdiction-specific rules when a simple but-for test does not fit. The plaintiff still must connect the defendant's conduct with the injury through evidence rather than speculation.

Legal or Proximate Cause

Legal cause limits responsibility even when factual causation exists. It asks whether the type of harm and the manner in which it occurred are sufficiently connected to the risk that made the conduct negligent. Foreseeability is commonly important, but jurisdictions frame the rule differently. A defendant is not necessarily responsible for every consequence in an endless chain of events. Intervening conduct may or may not cut off liability depending on whether it was extraordinary, intentional, or within the foreseeable risk. Proximate cause is not simply the event closest in time to the injury.

Damages

The plaintiff must have a legally recognized injury. Damages may include physical injury, property loss, medical expenses, lost income, pain, emotional harm recognized by law, and other compensable consequences. Nominal damages are generally not available for ordinary negligence without actual harm. The plaintiff must also prove the amount with reasonable evidence. A serious breach that causes no injury does not ordinarily support a negligence award, although regulators or other legal doctrines may address the conduct.

1(a). What Does Negligence Per Se Mean?

Negligence per se is a doctrine under which violation of a statute or regulation can establish or strongly affect the breach element of negligence. The doctrine does not mean that every legal violation automatically produces civil liability. Courts commonly ask whether the law was designed to protect a class of persons that includes the plaintiff and whether it was intended to prevent the type of harm that occurred. A licensing statute designed only to raise revenue may not establish negligence per se, while a traffic law designed to prevent collisions may be more directly relevant.

Jurisdictions differ in the legal effect. A violation may constitute negligence as a matter of law, create a rebuttable presumption, or serve only as evidence of negligence. The defendant may be able to show a legally recognized excuse, such as impossibility, emergency, incapacity, or that compliance would have created greater danger. The plaintiff must still prove causation and damages. A driver may violate a safety statute, but if the violation did not cause the plaintiff's injury, negligence per se does not complete the claim.

2. Why Are Factual Cause and Legal Cause Both Important?

Factual cause and legal cause answer different questions. Factual cause determines whether the defendant's conduct played a necessary or legally sufficient role in producing the harm. Legal cause determines whether the law should attribute that harm to the defendant. Both requirements prevent liability from resting on coincidence or limitless chains of consequence.

Consider a bus driver who runs a red light and strikes a car. But for the driver's violation, the collision may not have occurred, so factual cause is straightforward. The risk of a traffic collision is also the very risk that makes running the light negligent, so legal cause is likely satisfied. Suppose, however, that the collision delays a passenger, who later misses a flight, takes another plane, and suffers an unrelated accident caused by a remote event. The bus driver's conduct may be part of the historical sequence, but legal cause limits responsibility for consequences outside the foreseeable scope of the traffic risk.

Multiple Causes

An injury often has more than one cause. A plaintiff's preexisting condition, another driver's negligence, defective equipment, and delayed medical treatment may all contribute. A defendant does not escape liability merely because another cause was also present. The legal system uses comparative responsibility, joint-liability rules, contribution, and causation doctrines to allocate consequences. The exact approach varies by jurisdiction.

Intervening and Superseding Causes

An intervening event occurs after the defendant's conduct and contributes to the harm. It becomes superseding only when the law treats it as breaking the chain of responsibility. Ordinary rescue, foreseeable medical negligence, or a predictable reaction to danger may not be superseding. Highly extraordinary or intentional conduct may be. The analysis focuses on the scope of risk rather than applying a mechanical rule that any later event absolves the first actor.

3. What Is the Doctrine of Res Ipsa Loquitur?

Res ipsa loquitur means “the thing speaks for itself.” The doctrine permits, but does not always require, an inference of negligence when the precise careless act is difficult for the plaintiff to identify and the accident is of a kind that ordinarily does not occur without negligence. A classic illustration is an object falling from a controlled building or surgical equipment left inside a patient. The event itself, combined with the surrounding circumstances, provides circumstantial evidence.

Traditional formulations require the plaintiff to show that the event ordinarily would not occur in the absence of negligence, that the instrumentality was within the defendant’s exclusive control or responsibility, and that the plaintiff did not cause the event. Modern courts may apply these ideas flexibly, especially when several defendants or complex institutions controlled the relevant process. The doctrine does not automatically prove causation and damages, nor does it convert every unexplained accident into liability. It shifts or supports the evidentiary inference so the case can be evaluated without direct proof of the exact negligent act.

4. What Defenses May Apply to Negligence?

Defenses can challenge the plaintiff’s proof or reduce or eliminate recovery. A defendant may deny duty, breach, causation, or damages. The defendant may also rely on contributory negligence, comparative negligence, assumption of risk, immunity, limitation periods, preemption, or other jurisdiction-specific doctrines. The original assignment identifies the three most familiar conduct-based defenses.

Contributory Negligence

Under traditional contributory negligence, a plaintiff whose own lack of reasonable care contributed to the injury could be barred from recovery. Only a small number of United States jurisdictions retain a strict version of this rule. Because the result can be severe, exceptions and related doctrines may apply. The defendant bears the burden of proving the plaintiff’s negligent conduct and causal contribution.

The fact that a plaintiff could have acted more carefully does not automatically establish contributory negligence. The plaintiff’s conduct is judged in context, including age, emergency, disability where legally relevant, and the circumstances created by the defendant. A person reacting instinctively to danger may not be held to the same calm judgment available in hindsight.

Comparative Negligence

Most jurisdictions use some form of comparative fault. The factfinder assigns percentages of responsibility, and the plaintiff's damages are reduced accordingly. Under pure comparative negligence, a plaintiff can recover a reduced amount even when more responsible than the defendant. Under modified systems, recovery is barred when the plaintiff's responsibility reaches or exceeds a specified threshold, commonly 50 or 51 percent. The precise rule is statutory and jurisdiction-specific.

Comparative fault promotes proportionality but can become complex when several defendants, nonparties, product sellers, employers, or intentional actors are involved. Rules about joint and several liability determine whether one defendant may be responsible for more than that defendant's percentage when others cannot pay.

Assumption of Risk

Assumption of risk applies when a plaintiff knowingly and voluntarily encounters a particular danger. Express assumption may arise from a valid waiver or agreement. Implied assumption may arise from conduct demonstrating actual knowledge and voluntary acceptance. The doctrine does not mean that participation in an activity accepts every form of negligence. A spectator may accept ordinary risks inherent in a sport but not concealed hazards or reckless conduct outside the activity's normal character.

Waivers are subject to public policy, clarity, bargaining conditions, statutory restrictions, and the nature of the service. Many jurisdictions treat implied assumption of risk within comparative-fault analysis rather than as a complete defense. A defendant cannot simply post a warning and avoid all duties.

Statute of Limitations and Repose

A negligence action must be filed within the applicable limitation period. The period may begin at injury, discovery, or another legally defined event, and tolling rules may apply. Product cases may also be subject to a statute of repose that bars claims after a specified period following sale or manufacture regardless of later discovery. These rules vary significantly and can determine whether an otherwise valid claim may proceed.

5. What Is a Strict-Liability Tort?

Strict liability imposes responsibility without requiring the plaintiff to prove that the defendant acted negligently or intended harm. The plaintiff must still establish the elements of the particular doctrine, including causation and injury. Strict liability is not absolute liability for every accident. It applies in defined categories because the law assigns certain risks to the person who creates or distributes them.

Traditional examples include abnormally dangerous activities, certain harms caused by animals, and defective products. Blasting with explosives may be considered abnormally dangerous because significant residual risk remains even when reasonable care is used. The activity's appropriateness to the location, common usage, risk magnitude, and ability to eliminate danger through care may be considered. Rules concerning animals differ for wild animals, domestic animals known to be dangerous, livestock, and local statutes.

Product Liability

Product liability refers to legal responsibility for injuries caused by defective products. Claims can be based on negligence, strict liability, breach of warranty, misrepresentation, consumer-protection law, or statute. Cornell's Legal Information Institute summarizes product-liability theories as including negligence, strict liability, and warranty and notes that responsibility may extend along the chain of manufacture and distribution (Cornell LII, 2026).

Manufacturing Defect

A manufacturing defect exists when a particular unit departs from its intended design. A bottle contaminated during production, a cracked component, or a missing safety part may be examples. The plaintiff generally compares the product with properly manufactured units or specifications. The fact that a product caused injury does not always prove a manufacturing defect; physical evidence, testing, production records, and expert analysis may be necessary.

Design Defect

A design-defect claim alleges that the product's intended design creates an unreasonable risk. Courts use different tests, including consumer expectations and risk-utility balancing. Risk-utility analysis may consider the severity and likelihood of harm, usefulness, cost, feasibility of an alternative design, and effect on product function. Some jurisdictions require proof of a reasonable alternative design. A safer design imagined after an accident is insufficient unless it was technically and economically feasible and would have reduced the relevant risk.

Failure to Warn

A product may be defective because it lacks adequate instructions or warnings about nonobvious risks. A warning should identify the nature and seriousness of the danger and explain reasonable precautions. Warnings do not substitute for a safer feasible design. Manufacturers may have duties concerning risks known or reasonably knowable at the time of sale, and some jurisdictions recognize post-sale duties in limited circumstances. In prescription-drug cases, the learned-intermediary doctrine may affect whether warnings are directed through the prescribing professional.

Causation in Product Cases

A plaintiff must connect the defect with the injury. The product must have been defective when it left the relevant defendant's control or responsibility, and the defect must cause the harm. Substantial alteration, misuse, comparative fault, state-of-the-art evidence, federal preemption, statutes of repose, and sophisticated-user doctrines may affect liability. Foreseeable misuse can sometimes be part of the design analysis; extraordinary misuse may defeat causation or create a defense.

Negligence and Strict Product Liability Compared

Negligence focuses on the defendant's conduct: whether the manufacturer, distributor, or seller used reasonable care in design, testing, production, inspection, warning, or recall. Strict product liability focuses more directly on the condition of the product and the risk it created. The distinction is important, but the evidence can overlap. Testing records, alternative designs, complaints, quality control, and warnings may be relevant under both theories. State product-liability statutes sometimes combine or modify traditional categories.

Burden of Proof and Evidence

The plaintiff generally must prove the claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Evidence may include photographs, medical records, physical products, maintenance records, contracts, witness testimony, expert analysis, standards, recall information, electronic data, and internal communications. Preserving the product is often critical. Spoliation—loss or destruction of evidence—can produce sanctions or adverse inferences. The defendant may challenge whether the product was defective, whether the plaintiff used it as claimed, whether another condition caused the injury, or whether damages are supported.

Conclusion

Negligence requires duty, breach, factual cause, legal cause, and damages. Negligence per se uses a relevant statutory violation to affect the breach analysis but does not eliminate the need for causation and harm. Factual cause determines whether conduct contributed to the injury; legal cause limits responsibility to harms within the relevant scope of risk. *Res ipsa loquitur* allows an inference of negligence from an event that ordinarily would not occur without negligence when direct proof is unavailable. Contributory negligence, comparative fault, and assumption of risk can reduce or bar recovery depending on jurisdiction. Strict liability applies without proof of negligence in defined areas such as abnormally dangerous activities, animals, and defective products. Product claims may involve manufacturing defects, design defects, and inadequate warnings. Because state law differs, the general doctrines must always be checked against the governing jurisdiction and facts.

References

American Law Institute. (1965). *Restatement (Second) of Torts*.

American Law Institute. (1998). *Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability*.

Cornell Legal Information Institute. (2026). *Negligence*. Wex legal dictionary.

Cornell Legal Information Institute. (2026). *Product liability*. Wex legal dictionary.

Dobbs, D. B., Hayden, P. T., & Bublick, E. M. (2020). *The law of torts* (2nd ed.). West Academic.